DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 053 HE 008 241

AUTHOR Carlson, Edgar M.; And Others
TITLE National Representation Project. Preliminary Report.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 107p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Conferences; *Educational Legislation; Evaluation; *General Education; *Higher Education; *National Organizations; *Organizations (Groups); *Private Schools; *Professional Associations; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS AAC; American Association of Colleges

ABSTRACT

The multiplicity and variety of organizations representing the national scope of higher education prompted the American Association of Colleges (AAC) and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities (NCICU) to study the Washington-based associations toward the end of reducing duplication and competition and achieving greater clarity of mission, particularly among those organizations supported by institutional dues. This study limits itself to attempting to answer two fundamental questions: What is the best way to represent nationally the interests of liberal education? and What is the best way to represent nationally the concerns of the independent sector of higher education? A survey was conducted among college presidents, other college officials, and state association directors. This data combined with information from conferences, interviews, and regional conferences led to a number of recommendations relating to the establishment of a separate organization to represent the special interests of the independent institutions; revisions in emphasis and structure of the AAC; and procedures for implementation. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED134053

1975

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION PROJECT

Association of American Colleges

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008241

Director - Edgar M. Carlson

Associate Directors

- Sister Ann Ida Gannon
- J. Victor Baldridge

FOREWORD

The multiplication of groupings within higher education is neither a parochial nor a contemporary phenomenon. DeTocqueville, writing in the last century, observed that "Americans are forever forming associations" around particular interest areas. Nevertheless even he might be appalled at the number and variety of organizations which compose what is sometimes referred to as today's "higher education bureaucracy."

With reference particularly to those of national scope the Association of American Colleges tried on several occasions in recent years to stimulate cooperative and comprehensive study of the Washington-based associations toward the end of reducing duplication and competition and achieving greater clarity of mission, particularly among those organizations supported by institutional dues -- but with disappointing results.

To look at its own mission in the larger context, therefore, the Board of Directors of AAC, in conjunction with the directors of its affiliate, the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, decided to sponsor a more limited study, one which would seek answers to two fundamental and related questions: What is the best way to represent nationally the interests of liberal education? and What is the best way to represent nationally the concerns of the independent sector of higher education? The report which follows is the result of that effort.

As indicated in the section on methodology, the directors of the study functioned quite independently of either board or staff. Further, the basis of funding -- with grants from five different foundations -- underscored the detachment with which the study was conducted. For its

thoroughness, objectivity, and rationality, therefore, the report is a model of its kind.

Our most sincere appreciation is due to Dr. Edgar Carlson and his two associate directors, Sister Ann Ida Gannon and J. Victor Baldridge; to the distinguished advisory committee whose names appear elsewhere in this document; to the supporting foundations -- Carnegie Corporation of New York, The Danforth Foundation, The Ford Foundation, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; and to the hundreds of participants from campuses and associations whose generous sharing of views contributed significantly to the substance of this report.

Frederic W. Ness, President
Association of American Colleges

DIRECTOR

Edgar M. Carlson

ASSOCIATE DIRECTORS

Sister Ann Ida Gannon
President
Mundelein College

J. Victor Baldridge
Assistant Vice President and
Dean of the Faculty
California State University, Fresno

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Luther H. Foster
President
Tuskegee Institute

Peggy Heim
Associate Director
NCHEMS

K. Duane Hurley
President Emeritus
Salem College

Eldon L. Johnson
Vice President
University of Illinois

Joseph A. Kershaw
Department of Economics
Williams College

William F. Miller
Provost and Vice President
Stanford University

Richard H. Sullivan
Assistant to the President
Carnegie Corporation of New York

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION PROJECT

Preliminary Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE .....pages i-iv

CHAPTER I. PERSPECTIVE.....pages 1-14

CHAPTER II. THE ISSUES.....pages 15-27

CHAPTER III. THE STUDY.....pages 28-35

CHAPTER IV. THE FINDINGS.....pages 36-63

CHAPTER V. THE RECOMMENDATIONS....pages 64-86

EXHIBIT A.....page 87

Table 1.....page 14a
Table 2.....page 30a
Table 3.....page 42a
Table 4.....page 43a
Table 5.....page 53a
Table 6.....page 53b
Table 7.....page 53c

PREFACE

The National Representation Project has dealt with issues that are important, complex, and sensitive. It has been pursued with as much thoroughness as an accelerated time schedule permitted. It has resulted in a set of recommendations which, if adopted, will substantially affect the pattern of national representation for both the independent colleges and universities and the liberal arts. While the major change relates to a separate national voice for the independent sector in higher education, proposals are made for enlarging the concerns and the participation of both independent and public institutions in the Association of American Colleges and for cooperative relations between it and other agencies and organizations which may be equally significant for the future of the larger educational enterprise.

We are persuaded that the recommendations accurately reflect our findings from nearly 150 personal interviews, 7 regional conferences attended by 200 representatives of institutions and associations, and the questionnaire responses of nearly 700 respondents, constituting over 60% of the combined membership of the Association of American Colleges and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities to which they were addressed.

The particular format developed for the study required a great deal of participation on the part of individuals and agencies. Presidents, deans, and other representatives of institutions were generous in granting time to our interviewers. The regional conferences would hardly have been possible without the active participation and encouragement of the directors of state associa-

tions, who in each case made the arrangements and stimulated attendance. The total number of hours involved in filling out a rather lengthy and complex questionnaire on the part of 700 institutions must have been very substantial. Leaders in various related organizations with an interest in our study encouraged cooperation by their member institutions and helped to assure the extensive participation reflected in the above statistics.

To a degree which may be exceptional, the conclusions to which this study has come were formed in the crucible of dynamic discussion and interaction. They could not have been formed without that process. The various levels of participation--the preliminary exploratory conference, interviews, regional conferences, questionnaire results--kept us continually in touch with what people in the institutions were thinking and saying. We could test our impressions from one level of the inquiry, such as the interviews, by trying them out in the regional conferences. We could check the representativeness of the attendees at regional conferences by our selected interviews and the questionnaire results. Each one who participated thus made a positive contribution to the eventual outcome.

The project staff wishes to record its gratitude to the Boards of AAC and NCICU and to President Fred Ness and his staff for the almost ideal arrangements made for the study, and for the helpfulness shown at every stage in its development. This included adequate funding, unhindered freedom in conducting the study, providing information and data requested, and proceeding to chart the course for implementation of the recommendations.

As Director of the Project, I wish particularly to express my gratitude to the Associate Directors, Sister Ann Ida Gannon and J. Victor Baldridge, who brought to the assignment unique and complementary experiences and abilities. As a former Chair Person of the AAC and of the ACE, and with a long career as an educator and administrator, Sister Ann Ida brought perspective and concern which could hardly have been equalled in any other person. As a professional in the field of higher education, with extensive experience in survey research and author of a number of well-known publications and as Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty at a large public university, Vic Baldridge provided recognized ability and objectivity. The Advisory Committee of seven members was as representative of all varieties of educational institution and activity as that number of people could be, and each one took the responsibility seriously. Among their number were a former president and a former chairman of AAC, one of the founders of CASC, representatives from a major private and a major public university, the director of a major AAC and NCICU study, and a professor with both foundation and administrative experience. Dr. Gerald Gurin of the University of Michigan, together with associate Carlos Arce, handled the questionnaire with skill and on schedule. Interviewers included, in addition to the Director and the two Associate Directors, K. Duane Hurley, former President of Salem College, West Virginia; President Ralph John of Western Maryland College; Professor Joseph A. Kershaw of Williams College; John Meng, former President of Tarrytown College in New York; President

William Quillian of Randolph-Macon Woman's College in Virginia; and John Stauffer, former President of Juniata College in Pennsylvania. Each of them contributed to the final outcome and the fact that a number of interviewers were involved provided a safeguard against the bias of any single interviewer. Susan Ahrens has assisted in a number of the analyses, tended the office during my extended absences, and ably provided all secretarial and typing services.

Chapter I. PERSPECTIVE

This is a study about present and anticipated needs in higher education, and what provision should be made at the national level in order to meet those needs most effectively in the future. The focus is properly on the present and emerging environment in which institutions of higher education find themselves. But some historical perspective is needed in order to talk intelligently about the way things are. As we have pursued the study "out in the field" on nearly one hundred and fifty campuses and in a series of regional conferences involving about two hundred representatives of institutions, we have been impressed by how frequently present problems and practises have had to be illuminated by reference to historical developments. Organizations are not merely mechanisms that function according to the current intention of their boards and administrators. They have histories and traditions and habits of action which reflect past policies and which, to some extent at least, condition current responses. A brief glimpse at the history of the Association of American Colleges may provide us with a helpful framework within which to consider some of the problems and issues which are now before it.

The Association of American Colleges

The AAC has one of the longest and most distinguished histories of national educational organizations. It was founded in 1915, in New York state, by a group of college leaders deeply committed to the independent liberal arts colleges, most of which were sponsored by church denominations and which would have fit into the image of what was later to be somewhat eulogistically referred

to as "America's small hill-top colleges." The purpose of the organization was declared to be

> the consideration of questions relating to the promotion of higher education in all its forms, in the independent and denominational colleges in the United States which shall become members of this Association, and the discussion and prosecution of such questions and plans as may tend to make more efficient the institutions included in the membership of the Association.

Membership was open to "colleges which conform to the definition of minimum college given in the By-Laws." The relevant By-Law did not severely limit admission by any qualitative characteristic or idealistic commitment. It quite simply said that to be eligible for membership "institutions shall require fourteen units for admission to the Freshman class and shall require 120 semester hours for graduation." The latter requirement was not ironbound but could be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Association.

It is worth noting that there is no direct reference in the founding documents to either liberal arts or undergraduate education, but only to "independent and denominational colleges." They were, of course, undergraduate and liberal arts, and this may have seemed too obvious for comment. However, it does seem clear that the AAC came into existence to serve the needs of a group of institutions rather than to promote specific philosophies of education. Indeed the founding fathers sound highly practical, and somewhat mundane, when they characterize those services as "the discussion and the prosecution of such plans as may tend to make more efficient the institutions included in the membership of the Association." If one explores some of the early projects of the AAC that impression is heightened.

For instance, the very first meeting of the AAC had before it a proposal for an interdenominational campaign for the purposes of "increasing the income and patronage of the colleges." The 1916 meeting had as its theme "The Efficient College" and a major committee during the first three years occupied itself with the definition of a "minimum college." There are more than a dozen pages of statistical tables in the 1916 annual report covering such items as minimum needs in curriculum, faculty, administration, operating expense, property, student-teacher ratios, salary levels, sources of income, cost per student, and plant and endowment requirements. The major endeavors of the first three years seem not to have concerned definitions of liberal arts but were almost wholly devoted to the reports on "the efficient college" and the "workable minimum college." The president of the Association in 1916 stated its purposes succintly in three points: 1) the Association would learn the truth about the college, 2) it would tell the truth about the college, and 3) it would make better colleges.

What were the circumstances which led to the shift from "independent and denominational" to the more philosophic concerns for the "liberal arts and sciences"? The first change occurred in 1926. The first paragraph of the Constitution was then revised to read

> The purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges which shall become members of this Association and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions in its membership.

The major change, of course, is the deletion of "independent and denominational," although it may be noted that it now affirms the intention to promote higher education in all its forms, and not merely to consider questions relating to

that promotion. The minutes do not provide any clues as to where the pressure for the change may have come from. There appears to have been interest among the public institutions to enter since a hasty check of the membership list in 1927 indicates 20-25 names that were either state or municipal institutions.

It was not until 1958, twenty-three years after its founding, that there is any reference in either the Constitution or By-Laws to liberal arts. In that year the statement of purpose was amended to read

> The purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences which shall become members, etc.

At the same time the article dealing with membership, which had previously dealt with the definition of a "minimum college" was revised to read

> The membership of the Association shall be composed of those colleges of liberal arts and sciences which may be duly elected to membership in the Association after recommendation by the Board of Directors.

It was not until 1956 that it was felt necessary to add to "colleges of arts and sciences" the additional phrase "and universities having colleges of liberal arts and sciences," and it was in 1958 that the eligibility of institutions outside the USA was precisely defined by limiting it to institutions "located within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States of America or incorporated under American law."

As one scans the annual programs and reports over the years one is impressed how the focus shifts with time and circumstances. Indeed, one gets a strong impression that the AAC has been sensitive to emerging needs and flexible in the responses it has been able and willing to make to those needs. For instance, by noting the numbers and names of commissions, their appearance and disappearance,

and setting them against the conditions of the times in which the colleges were working, one can readily detect the concerns which rated high in the minds of institutional administrators.

The preoccupation of the earliest years with efficiency and the minimum college has already been noted and may properly remind current harried administrators that making ends meet and achieving or maintaining academic quality are concerns which have been around a long time. In the twenties one encounters Commissions on College Architecture (there was a college building boom in the twenties), Organization of College Curriculum, Faculty and Student Scholarship, Objectives and Ideals, Sabbatical Leaves, and Academic Freedom. In the thirties one encounters Commissions also on College Athletics, Educational Surveys, Cost of College Education, Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, Permanent and Trust Funds. Back in 1935 there was already a Committee on Federal Legislation (coinciding with federal student aid programs such as NYA). In 1942 there was a Commission on Colleges and Post-War Problems, planning ahead for the hoped-for peace which was still three years away. In 1950 and for a number of years thereafter prominence is given to a Commission on Minority Groups in Higher Education. By 1955 Pre-Professional Education had become enough of a concern to set up a special commission to deal with it. The same was true for International Understanding in 1960. The Commission on Faculty and Staff Benefits first appeared in 1958 and continued into the late 1960's.

Some commissions were quite transient but others were more durable. For instance, the Commission on Academic Freedom and (Academic) Tenure first appeared in 1934 and continued until 1965. The Commission on the Arts began in 1939 and continued to 1965.

(Between 1936 and 1941 the Arts Program arranged 710 visits for "faculty-artists" and "national artists" at 353 institutions.)

Commissions disappear from the roster apparently for one of two reasons. In some cases the interests or concerns diminish to the point where they drop out of the commission structure, in many cases being absorbed into another more general assignment. But there are a number of commissions which gradually disappear from the agenda for the opposite reason. They become too important, or too complex, or too dynamic, to be adequately handled by a commission. They come to have an agenda of their own and in time create their own organizational structure to pursue those interests or are merged into other organizations that have arisen to meet those specific needs. Because these parallel to a degree the situation which now confronts us, it may be instructive to follow some of these earlier developments.

There was a Commission on Teacher Education from 1958 to 1965. It is not difficult to understand why the member colleges would feel the need for special attention in this area since they were sending many, and in some cases most, of their graduates into teaching. But why did it disappear in 1965? It was certainly not unrelated to the fact that by then the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education had become the major channel through which these concerns were being met, and that the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education had assumed responsibility for maintaining standards of performance. Indeed, the final report of the Commission makes specific reference to its liaison with the AACTE, the "increasing amount of overlapping in the memberships in these two associations" and the need for

continued diligence with respect to NCATE's accrediting activities to prevent the undue subordination of liberal learning to more quantitative requirements. It is quite clear that the major portion of the concerns which had kept the Commission going were now being cared for by AACTE and NCATE.

There was a Commission on Public Relations from 1931 to 1957, when it became a Commission on Public Information, which in turn disappeared in 1960, the same year in which another commission of the Association commends the activities of the American College Public Relations Association for activities which had earlier been the concern of the Commission on Public Relations. Again, it seems clear that a commission of the AAC had been superceded by a specialized organization whose membership was not wholly coordinate with AAC's membership.

The most enlightening parallel to our current concern is the Commission on Colleges and Industry. It was established at the annual meeting in 1948 for the purpose of improving understanding between education and corporations generally and encouraging the private support of higher education in general but of the independent sector in particular. Almost simultaneously, and in response to the same set of interests, state fund-raising associations were being formed. Their growth was so rapid and their vitality was such that by 1953 the membership of AAC's Commission on Colleges and Industry was made to consist of the presidents of the respective state associations. The character and activities of the Commission immediately reflected this change. In 1954 a workshop on the subject was held and an Action Committee chosen to develop programs and acitivities. A "clearing house" was established and independent

funding secured for an initial three year period. A quarterly news bulletin was published and mailed to all AAC members. In 1956 a national depository was established, called the American College Fund, under the name and supervision of the AAC. Joint national solicitation of corporations was arranged. The activity came to have a life and structure of its own which rapidly outgrew the commission structure under which it was presumed to be operating. The writer has reviewed his own recollections of that period with others more directly involved and has confirmed his own impression of the "growing pains" of that movement and the consequent discomfort experienced on both sides before the Board of the Association voted in 1958 "that the soliciting of corporation gifts for colleges should be dissociated as soon as possible from the Commission, and suggested the incorporation of a separate body, to become legally and financially independent of the Association of American Colleges by January 1960." The Independent College Funds of America was incorporated as a separate organization in December of 1958, with thirty state and regional associations as members. It has gone on to become an important element in the private support of independent undergraduate colleges. In the most recent year, 1974, members raised a total of $22,460,000 from 16,680 corporate donors, and the cumulative total gathered for current operations is over a quarter billion dollars. The Commission on Colleges and Industry became the Commission on College Finance in 1960, and was now, as the Chairman noted, "freed to devote itself to areas of financial concern for the entire membership of the Association, public and private."

The Concern for Legislation

Almost from the beginning the question of the relation between the colleges and government has been somewhere in the consciousness of those who have guided the Association. During the very first years of its existence there was a paper on whether and under what conditions it would be proper for a private college to receive state support. We have noted the Committee on Federal Legislation in the mid-thirties. We should also acknowledge that one of the reasons for the founding of the American Council on Education in 1918 was national representation of higher education's common interests. The AAC was one of the founding organizations of the ACE and for many years did not feel the need of direct participation in any aspect of federal relations. It was not until the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958 that the Association began to assume active involvement in monitoring and helping to formulate federal policy with respect to higher education. The first report from the new Commission on Legislation was made in 1959. It takes note of the passage of the above Act and explains that "in view of the division of opinion revealed by the debate at Miami Beach (1958) on federal aid to higher education" and since there did not appear to be any conflict with the broad principles enunciated at that meeting "we did not in fact give testimony."

However, by the following year consensus had crystallized sufficiently to remove any ambiguity with regard to the interests of the member colleges in federal programs of support, and the activities of the Commission became more substantial and positive. The annual reports generally summarize congressional actions

of significance and indicate cooperation on most matters with the ACE's Commission on Federal Relations. In 1965 the Commission on Legislation came to an end and its functions were largely merged into the Commission on College and Society. Although it had other functions, the 1969 report says "legislation and federal relations have tended to dominate the Commission's agenda." In particular, according to that report, it has been concerned to supplement ACE testimony by independent or even contrary positions on specific items, and it has carried a particular concern for the "undergraduate and liberal arts education," "the small institution, whether public or private, rather than the large complexly-structured university," and for "institutions under private control."

As in the fifties in the field of fund-raising, the sixties saw the development of state associations concerned with policy in the general area of public support of education, primarily at the state level but also at the federal level. As early as 1964 chief officers of several of these associations began meeting together to exchange information and to share legislative strategies and programs. These meetings came to be associated with other national meetings, including those of the AAC. Gradually they developed relationships which required some structural framework. A "Coordinating Committee of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities" held an open hearing at the AAC meeting in 1968. The writer's review of his notes from that meeting indicate clearly the several concerns which people had about a new organization. The fund-raising associations wanted to preempt the term "state association" and hoped that its use could be

avoided. There was another movement which had held several meetings laying stress on more specific concern for quality liberal arts colleges than they felt the AAC could offer. There was some reluctance on the part of the AAC to be too closely associated with the movement, recalling the difficulties encountered in attempting to accommodate the fund-raising associations within the structure of the AAC. Officers were elected and steps were taken toward organization. An arrangement was worked out by which the AAC would provide space and staff services. A meeting of the emerging Federation of State Associations of Independent Colleges and Universities was held in Denver on October 9, 1968, (in connection with ACE) and the first annual meeting was held in Pittsburgh on January 13, 1969 (in connection with AAC). A constitution was adopted, which stated broad purposes in support of higher education in general, but with specific commitment to speak "for the member associations where that united voice is needed," "to promote and assist member associations" in fulfilling their functions, and to "represent the interest and to protect the general welfare of the non-profit, tax exempt independent colleges and universities in the total states' enterprise of higher education." With respect to "Affiliation and Policy Declaration" the Constitution said

> This Federation shall be affiliated with the Association of American Colleges and shall be provided central offices and staff services by the Association. The Federation shall have the right and responsibility to make and issue its own policy and position statements. It will ordinarily work through the Association of American Colleges and its officers or Board of Directors on national policy and legislative matters affecting the state associations and its members, but may deal directly

with the American Council on Education and/or other agencies and the government when necessary.

The Federation pursued a number of programs effectively, including the development of rather comprehensive proposals for federal programs, and carried on extensive information services and workshops for the upgrading of staff and improvement of programs at all levels. Nonetheless, the arrangement appeared to be deficient in several respects. Institutions and their presidents were not directly involved in FSAICU. Presidents considered AAC to be their major instrument for policy determination while state association directors and chairmen operated the Federation. It was judged desirable to try to effect a further integration of the two organizations and activities while retaining a desirable amount of autonomy. Consequently a "Memorandum of Agreement" was drawn up between the AAC and the FSAICU, which was incorporated into a new constitution adopted in January of 1971. As compared with the earlier constitution, major changes were: 1) provision was made for institutions as well as associations to be members--all institutions belonging to a state association were automatically members, 2) the name was changed to the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, 3) the President of the AAC was made Executive Vice Chairman of the Board of NCICU with responsibility for administrative supervision and coordination of the staff work of the Council.

This arrangement retained an independent Board for the Council and continued the provision of staff and services through the AAC. Each organization was declared free to issue its own policy and position statements and deal directly with other agencies but it

was agreed that NCICU will "ordinarily work with and through the Association of American Colleges and its officers or Board of Directors on national policy and legislative matters affecting members of the Council." It was agreed that while both organizations had the right of private action "their common concerns render it both desirable and probable that they will normally act in concert."

Since the above revision in 1971 there has continued to be rapid development of state association activities and great increases in state programs of support, resulting from such activities. There has also been progress of substantial character at the federal level. The staff has been increased from one in 1968 to four in 1975. Estimates made by budget personnel of the AAC are that approximately one-third of the total AAC budget for the current year is being absorbed by the public policies function, and perhaps more than that if total time expenditures were assignable.

The emergence of the state associations as a factor in federal relations is reflected in the merger of legislation with other concerns in the transition from the Commission on Legislation (which ended in 1965) to its successor, the Commission on College and Society. The disappearance of that commission in 1971 is concurrent with the formalization of relations between the AAC and the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. Once again, a concern had become too large and vital to be wholly contained within an Association commission.

Even this brief review illustrates and documents our earlier observation that AAC has been sensitive to the needs that have arisen and has been adaptable to change. In any assessment of the contribution of the AAC to American higher education one would have to take

note of the activities which it has spawned or nurtured which have subsequently developed their own structures, as well as the continuous concern for the kind of education and the kind of institution which has been characteristic of its membership.

Current AAC and NCICU membership and enrollment data are given in Table 1.

Table 1

MEMBERSHIP DATA--AAC and NCICU (7-1-75)

AAC	
Current membership	712
On special status (non-paying)	19
Current paying membership	692
Public members	90
Private paying membership	602

NCICU	
Total current membership	1001
State associations	36
Members of state associations	952
Non-association members in states having associations	8
Members from states not having associations	43

ENROLLMENT DATA (Headcount 1974)

	AAC Members Private		AAC Members Public		NCICU but not AAC	
Size	Number of Institutions	Number of Students	Number of Institutions	Number of Students	Number of Institutions	Number of Students
Below 501	40	15,489	0	0	154	47,071
501 - 1100	210	168,664	1	1,078	145	108,479
1101 - 2000	179	262,388	4	6,136	48	67,758
2001 - 5001	116	339,924	17	54,028	26	78,280
5001 - 10,000	45	328,082	15	105,319	11	73,423
10,001 - 15,000	12	146,418	13	165,212	1	12,296
Over 15,000	10	193,483	39	946,935	0	0
Total	612	1,454,448	89	1,278,708	385	387,307

Chapter II. THE ISSUES

The assignment given the National Representation Project was to attempt to find answers to three sets of questions which had been formulated by an advisory group convened by the Association of American Colleges in January of 1975.

1. What would be the best possible form of national organization to represent the interests of private higher education? What is the case for such an organization? What consequences are to be expected from the establishment of such an organization? What would be the implications for AAC and NCICU?

2. What would be the best possible form of national organization to represent the public interest in undergraduate liberal education? What is the case for such an organization? What would be the implications, generally and for AAC in particular?

3. Could the functions of the two organizations contemplated in (1) and (2) be satisfactorily combined in a single organization?

This formulation of the issues was the end product of extended consideration by the staff of AAC and the preparation of a "Priorities Committe Report" detailing present and prospective activities, which was considered by the AAC Board in November of 1974. There had been simultaneous initiatives underway in the NCICU Board, where a special ad hoc committee had called upon "the executive Boards of AAC and NCICU to establish a joint committee to investigate the possible roles, structure, and organization of both organizations." The AAC Board, at its meeting on January 11, 1975, endorsed a recommendation for a "detached and objective" study of AAC activities. The advisory group referred to above was convened pursuant to that action and proposed the above formulation of the issues.

In submitting its case for such a study to the supporting foundations, the AAC said in part:

> There is growing evidence that the dual system of higher education, comprising a strong private and public sector, is in jeopardy. Similarly, education in the liberal arts and sciences--traditionally nurtured by private colleges and universities, though not by them alone--is endangered by a mounting and potentially exaggerated emphasis, responding to social and economic pressures, on the vocational and the technical. Current economic conditions are intensifying these threats to the point of grave urgency.
>
> While these nationwide dangers come to a visible focus in the problems of individual institutions, the best hope of resolving them lies in some form of cooperative action. If the issues are to be addressed at the national level, a major share of the responsibility falls upon the organizations most broadly representative of the public and institutional interests involved.

The proposal took note of the growth in number and influence of state associations of independent colleges and universities with a national interest, as well as the increasing number of other groups of colleges for either general or specialized purposes, which compete for the time and resources of institutions and for the time and attention of government. To quote again

> While diversity remains a cherished and valid academic ideal this tangle of overlapping and in some measure competing organizations imposes heavy demands on the human and material resources of collegiate institutions. It has an unavoidable impact on the ability and willingness of the individual institution to support national multipurpose associations like the Association of American Colleges. Perhaps such associations are no longer viable, but in any case the problem remains of how to maintain an adequate national presence for both liberal education and the private institution in face of increasing diffusion. Certainly, current developments are intensifying to near breaking point the historic tension in AAC between its philosophic commitment to liberal education and its championship of the private sector. But, whatever the outcome, the Board of Directors of AAC is profoundly convinced that, rather than let the situation slide into fragmentation and entropy, the issues should be explicitly, frankly and rationally confronted.

It was under these directives and with this sense of urgency that the directors of the National Representation Project undertook their study. The sense of urgency was further underscored when the time span was reduced from twelve to nine months in order that recommendations might be ready for the annual meetings of the two organizations February 8-10.

Before proceeding to the study itself it will be in order to comment somewhat further about the "independent" sector and about "liberal education." Both concepts carry a range of meanings, among advocates and detractors, and it may be well to identify the meanings which we wish them to convey and the boundaries which we intend to honor.

Independent Colleges and Universities

There is no very satisfactory way of defining the "dual" system of providing public services which is characteristic of our nation. To assign the term "public" exclusively to institutions sponsored by a unit of government overlooks the very large range of public services performed by what are generally described as "private" institutions. The public services rendered by private hospitals, for instance, is acknowledged in federal legislation which guarantees "free choice of vendor" to the recipient of Medicare. In effect, that provision says that the public responsibility for health cannot be met without granting such free choice to the recipient. There are other parallels in the field of health and welfare where non-public facilities are in every respect equally eligible for government-sponsored programs of care for the individual who needs it.

If the term "private" is applicable anywhere it would probably be with respect to in-service type programs of education where the benefits from the expenditures are expected to be reaped almost entirely by the sponsor. This would be true whether the agency were private or public. Churches supporting theological seminaries for the training of their clergy, industries training technicians for their own employment, or welfare departments upgrading their own personnel through their own programs might be illustrations of activities that could properly be described as private. Certainly one cannot describe the training of nurses or teachers, or physicians or competent citizens as a private activity just because the institution engaged in it is not state-sponsored. To a degree, of course, all educational programs benefit the individual and are in that sense private, but this is equally true whether the institution attended is public or non-public.

The term "independent" can be criticized also. It may claim too much for the institution so designated. Present circumstances certainly testify to the vulnerability of independent colleges. The more "free-standing" they are in theory the more vulnerable they may be in fact. No small part of the urgency in our present assignment arises from the "dependence" of these institutions on public policies.

The term may also seem to imply that public institutions are by contrast "dependent" institutions. To be sure they are more dependent on legislatures and governmental decisions than their non-public counterparts, but any wise government will do what it can to ensure maximum independence for its institutions with regard

to educational purposes and programs.

We have chosen to use the term "independent" rather than "private" in this document. On balance, it seems more relevant to the issues under discussion. We do not intend that it should imply anything about public institutions. In this respect, it seems parallel to the term "public" which may be a relatively accurate description of that sector if it does not imply that other institutions have only private purposes and goals.

The importance of the independent sector in higher education has been documented so often in recent years that it ought not now be in question. Reference is made to the excellent statement on "The Case for Private Higher Education" in A National Policy for Private Higher Education produced by the NCICU Task Force directed by Peggy Heim and published in 1974, and to the extracts from and summaries of the reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the Committee for Economic Development, the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, and the Special Task Force of HEW, contained in Appendix A of that report.

There is, nonetheless, very grave concern about the future of the independent sector. This concern is not limited to higher education but it is more acute there than it is for instance in health, or social service agencies.

The reason is that the independent sector in education has operated under an almost unique disability from which it cannot extricate itself. To the extent that the problems of independent institutions derive from their own failure to develop sound programs of education and to utilize all available sources of support, they should be expected to remedy any such deficiencies as the price of survival.

There is no responsibility on the part of either private or public sources to "save" institutions that hold no promise of becoming effective institutions even under normally acceptable conditions. This is true when the institutions are public as well as when they are independent. What an increasing number of students of higher education as well as college administrators are coming to feel, however, is that many good independent colleges, with able leadership and doing everything right may not be able to survive--unless there are substantial changes made in public policies regarding the total pattern of support for higher education.

The difference between the problems of the private sector in higher education and in other fields relates principally to the almost total reliance on "provider" subsidies in education and the proportionately greater reliance on "consumer" subsidies in other fields. That is, in education the tradition has been and still is to channel public support to institutions which provide the public service at little or no cost to the consumer. This was originally true also in health and welfare. City and county hospitals, county poor farms, orphanages, and similar institutional provisions represent the earliest efforts of the public sector to meet growing social needs. In all of these areas public policy has shifted almost entirely, or at least substantially, to channeling support to individuals who then use their funds where they will. Indeed, Medicare as noted above guarantees "free choice of vendor" to the recipient and the federal government will sue a county which seeks to limit availability of any form of medical care to those who utilize a public facility. While there continue to be very large support programs at both the state and federal

level for various kinds of capital grants and categorical aids in the delivery of health services, some of which are limited to public dispensers of such services, the bulk of health care costs are collected through the user and are delivered to the vendor of his choice. It must be apparent to anyone that independent hospitals, whatever their problems may be, operate under quite different competitive conditions compared to their public counterparts than is the case in education.

One of the factors affecting this disparity is the relatively greater role of state governments in the funding of higher education. The federal government has in fact never made a distinction between public and independent recipients for any of its programs. Even the Land-Grant College Act in 1862 included at least two independent institutions. As the federal government has become involved in a variety of programs of aid to higher education, both institutions and students, it has maintained the same policy. More recently states have become involved in student aid programs, and this now constitutes one of the most rapidly growing components of state higher education funding. Nonetheless, it is still true of state funding, that the percentage of funds going to consumer subsidies in education is but a small fraction of that going to provider subsidies in the form of direct grants to institutions. Even if state and federal programs are taken together the disparity between consumer and provider subsidies, compared to other public service programs such as health and welfare is very marked.

There may be reasons why we cannot expect the same developments in education which have occurred in most other areas in which extensive public services are provided to the citizens of the

country. The investment in the public sector may be too large already to shift any significant proportion of these resources to students with "free choice of vendor" privileges. It may be preferable to find ways of extending provider subsidies to the independent sector. But until major policy decisions are made which give reasonable assurance of relatively stable sources of support from public sources either through students or directly or both, the independent sector will face a hazardous future.

However, more is at stake than the survival of institutions. This nation has imbedded in its philosophy and tradition a conception of shared responsibility for the general welfare by both public and independent agencies. It is not a historical accident that independently-sponsored hospitals, welfare agencies, schools and cultural institutions exist side by side with comparable publicly-sponsored institutions and agencies. The public-private way of providing public services is inherent in the American philosophy of government. Indeed, it may be that this principle is the most distinctive characteristic of American society. Even in most other western democracies it is assumed that privately-sponsored institutions and agencies should not enter fields in which government-sponsored services are available. Consequently tax policies in those countries do not allow charitable deductions for support of such independent ventures. In this country it is public policy to encourage independently-sponsored agencies to perform such public services and to that end we do provide tax exemptions and tax deductions for charitable contributions. The American system considers privately-sponsored services to be fully

as legitimate as publicly-sponsored ones and equally desirable. If the private or independent sector were to be regarded as superfluous, or an intruder into fields which properly belong to the government, our nation would have undergone a basic transformation of far-reaching significance.

There is no reason to believe that all independent colleges now in existence will survive, or even that they ought to do so. The mortality rate has always been considerable. We need to remember, however, that few of these colleges are any longer in their infancy, when mortality rates are normally high. Many of them have celebrated at least one centennial and must be presumed to have rendered effective service. It is not enough to distinguish between the weak and the strong without inquiring whether public policies have doomed some institutions to weakness in spite of being well-managed and educationally effective. The inability to attract and hold students with a 5-1 tuition differential for comparably expensive educational programs does not necessarily mean that the institution has inherent weaknesses which will account for its demise. It is at least appropriate to inquire under what conditions it could continue to serve the educational needs of our citizens. Would it be viable, for instance, if the tuition differential were reduced to 3-1? For clearly the responsibility of government is to its citizens, not to institutions, either public or independent.

The Liberal Arts

Liberal arts education has been put on the defensive. News reports and columnists keep us informed of the comparative

disadvantage which liberal arts graduates are said to have in securing employment. "Career education" has become a slogan and an exceptionally effective key for unlocking public funds. Career development, or career oriented programs, constitute the bulk of curricular changes at institutions.

In the analysis of our study which follows we will note evidences of uncertainty about the future role of the liberal arts, ambiguity about what the term implies, and some weakening of commitment among many of the institutions who participated. Although definitions of terms were only incidental to the purposes of our study it seems in place to essay some general comments at this point about what we do and do not mean when we speak in this report about the liberal arts (or liberal learning). We do not intend to involve ourselves in the on-going debate so much as to clarify our frames of reference.

1. We do not see the issue in terms of whether college graduates should acquire skills as a part of their education. Clearly they must at least have acquired the skills of analysis and interpretation of data, the ability to communicate with others using whatever present or future language or symbols may be used for that purpose, skills in visualizing and comparing alternatives in reaching both major and minor decisions in their personal lives and as participating members of a democratic society. They must also acquire at least minimum skills in performing some compensable activity sufficient to grant them entrance into the work force. There may be differences of opinions as to which sorts of skills are primary and the relative emphasis each deserves, but the

disagreement on these points should not obscure the recognition that education at the college level is concerned with the development of skills.

2. We are not prepared to yield the case for the relevance of liberal learning to career development on the basis of placement of graduates data, their immediate level of earnings, or even their early career promotions. We believe that liberal arts education is highly beneficial in terms of career-long performance, in adaptability to employment changes that occur, and in providing perspective and framework for upper-level appointments. Beyond the direct benefits discernible on-the-job, we also believe there are personal and social benefits which are inextricable from specific job qualifications in those positions where personal judgment and human relations are often crucial requirements in the person who occupies the post. It is time that research were undertaken to determine whether or not these convictions can be documented, but as of this date we know of no evidence that refutes the assertions made above.

3. It is increasingly difficult to identify the liberal arts with a specific set of institutions, or a specific group of departments or courses. It is quite possible that values, for instance, can be approached as effectively in programs that are "career-oriented" and that employ case-study or problem-solving approaches, as in the more traditional historical and theoretical approaches to the subject (providing someone has gone to the trouble of acquainting himself with the historical and theoretical resources). This does not mean that there are not some institutions

and departments which are characteristically more concerned with value questions and comparable issues than others. The situation which exists is partly the result of increased specialization in industry and the service professions into which graduates enter, with attendant demands for entrance skills. In part it is the result of the growing complexity and specialization of subject matter fields, which is highly efficient in dealing with the knowledge content of these fields but tends to be inefficient in meeting the personal need for wholeness in understanding and outlook. Whatever may be the reason for the present situation we grant that the national concern for liberal learning cannot be wholly coordinate with the concern for institutions that have called themselves liberal arts colleges or even for specific departments within institutions.

4. To deal adequately with those issues which have traditionally been comprehended in the liberal arts it may be necessary to restate them in other terms. For instance, we may need to ask in what respects higher education is an instrument to be used by other social structures to meet their self-chosen ends--such as industry and government--and to what extent it can appropriately choose its own ends. What functions of education are intrinsic and inherent in its own nature? What role would be left for education if we lived in a fully automated world which could operate without labor? To what extent are the needs of the state determinative in establishing educational programs, especially at the level at which education becomes elective? What needs do people have which are not subsumed under their job? One of the leaders

whom we interviewed reported that only one-fifth of the anticipated waking hours of a person's total life are now spent at work. If education is to be totally geared to work competence, how is the learning which he needs in order to be effective in the other four-fifths of his life to be acquired?

5. There are strong indications, especially on college campuses, of a growing concern about the larger issues of personal and social significance, morality and values. The editors of Change have recently spoken of a "recrudescence of the moral conscience in college youth and their institutions" and have conjectured that this may well "help shape a happier nation, and fulfill as well a central purpose of American institutions of higher education. At their best they have always sought to connect the life of action and the mind as the best wisdom for the future." (Change, February, 1975, "An American Agenda," p.10) Every analysis of the basic issues of our time finds itself driven to speak in terms of personal attitudes and commitments and social goals and purposes. We clearly do not need less attention in educational programs to those kinds of matters; we need more.

Chapter III. THE STUDY

Everyone concerned about this project emphasized the need for it to be detached and objective and to issue in concrete recommendations which could be implemented without delay. These were appropriate concerns. As we began our interviews and discussions we found many people having reservations at both points. Some felt that this was just "another study," that it would be "self-serving," and that nothing concrete and significant would come from it. We believe that in the process of the study we were able to assure participants of the serious intent of both the project directors and the sponsoring boards and the high probability that the findings would have a strong bearing on future developments.

We were greatly helped in that endeavor by the manner in which the boards and the administration proceeded in setting up the study. They sought and secured adequate outside funding from a group of foundations to whom they made commitments of broad purposes, serious intent, and readiness to act upon the findings. They arranged for a staff and an advisory committee that had no current connection with either AAC or NCICU but which represented considerable experience in the areas of special interest--that is, the role of the independent sector and concern for the liberal arts. They adopted a policy of non-involvement so far as the staff, officers, and board members of the two organizations were concerned. While available on request and helpful in providing a wide range of information, they adhered rigidly to this policy. The conclusions and recommendations described in this report have been developed in an atmosphere of confidence and freedom. The

only contraints upon us have been those imposed by our understanding of the facts and our realistic appraisal of the possibilities open.

In order to insure a fruitful study, which would result in direct and meaningful action, both boards arranged for procedures for consideration and implementation of recommendations at the annual meetings in February. Liaison representatives from the two boards have participated at our invitation in two general discussions of problems, issues, and probable outcomes.

The Mechanism

The staff consisted of a full-time director and two associate directors who were expected to give a minimum of two weeks of their time to the project, and in fact gave more than that. An advisory committee was provided, consisting of seven persons, which was as broadly representative of types of institutions and interests as that number of persons could be.

From the outset it was agreed by all concerned that this could not be a hypothetical restructuring of higher education's national agencies done in isolation from the felt needs and problems of a wide range of institutions. To get at such a grass-roots response it was necessary to conduct the study on the campuses and in the offices of the colleges and universities involved. Therefore the original plans called for extensive interviewing and a comprehensive questionnaire addressed to all member institutions. When the time span available was reduced from a year to nine months, in order to have recommendations available for this year's annual meetings, the number of interviews attempted was reduced from 200 to 125-150 and a series of seven regional

conferences was added. Also, an initial conference of about a dozen selected college and university presidents was held before the interviews were undertaken in order that all staff members might have direct impressions of what we needed to explore through the interviews and the questionnaire.

The Advisory Committee had an initial planning session late in May and a final review session in mid-November. They were kept continuously informed of developments, received various mailings, several of them participated in the interviewing, and most of them attended one of the regional conferences.

A total of 141 interviews were conducted of which 120 were interviews with representatives of institutions and 21 were with representatives of associations and agencies or educational specialists. The project director conducted 60 of those interviews, the assistant directors another 25 (plus participating in several group discussions) and the balance were conducted by six other interviewers engaged for that purpose. Two hundred persons attended the seven regional conferences, of which 175 were institutional representatives. Table 2 indicates the distribution of these contacts for both the interviews and the regional conferences with respect to sponsorship, type of institution, size, and geographical location. While the representation of the public sector may appear relatively modest, it is at least proportionate to the public representation in the total pool. We are dealing not only with the seven hundred members of AAC, of whom 90 are public, but also with the slightly more than one thousand members of the NCICU. Thus while public members constitute 12.6% of the membership of AAC they constitute only 8.2% of the total pool of institutions involved and constitute 11.2% of the institutions interviewed. There were in addition

Table 2

INSTITUTIONS INTERVIEWED Total: 120		REGIONAL CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS Total (Institutions): 175
Totals	**Classification**	**Totals**
106	Independent	168
14	Public	7
3	Under 501	21
30	501 - 1100	55
26	1101 - 2000	43
25	2001 - 5000	23
12	5001 - 10,000	18
9	10,001 - 15,000	5
15	Over 15,000	10
59	Church-Related	100
61	Independent	75
11	New England	17
34	Mid-East	40
23	Southeast	27
17	Great Lakes	27
17	Plains	28
3	Southwest	15
0	Rocky Mountain	5
15	Far West	16
77	Single-Purpose Colleges	138
43	Multi-Purpose Colleges	37
115	Four-Year Plus	152
5	Two-Year	23
21	Executives of Associations and Agencies (not included in the above totals)	25

conferences with several national organizations representing public institutions, including the Commission on Arts and Sciences of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Executive Director of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the President of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the past President and President of the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, and the Big Ten Deans of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (Big Ten and Chicago). There were also conferences with representatives of various comprehensive organizations such as the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards, and the American Association for Higher Education.

In the interests of coordinating our activities with organizations of more specific character we had interviews with representatives of denominational boards and agencies, such as the Division of Higher Education of the National Catholic Educational Association, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, the Christian College Consortium, and the Division of Higher Education of the United Methodist Church. We spent time with the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges and had what was in effect an eighth conference comparable to those held regionally with about 25 members of that organization. We had interviews with the President of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, The project director participated in two workshops of state asscciation directors, one in July and one in October.

While there are undoubtedly individuals and institutions, perhaps even groups of individuals and institutions, who feel that

they were not consulted, we trust that the above evidence of the scope of our inquiries will at least testify to the seriousness of our intent and the extent of our effort.

The most comprehensive involvement came through the questionnaire. It was mailed to 1139 persons who represented either AAC or NCICU members. Major work in conceptualizing the questionnaire was done by Associate Director J. Victor Baldridge (who has extensive experience in survey research both as student and instructor), on the basis of data provided, and after the initial conference with representative college presidents had been held late in June and a substantial number of interviews had been conducted. The actual printing, mailing and processing of the questionnaire, and the analysis of the returns was done by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, under the direction of Professor Gerald Gurin. As of this date (December 15) approximately 60% of the questionnaires have been returned and are included in the computations used elsewhere in this report. The questionnaire was in the mail the first days of October, as planned, and the processing and analysis of the first 368 responses was available for the Advisory Committee at its meeting in mid-November.

The Process

Because of the complex and sensitive nature of the undertaking the project staff exercised great care in its interpretation of the assignment and attempted to test its judgment with respect to a variety of issues as it progressed through the various stages of the study. At the outset, early in April, the Director of the study

submitted an initial document to the members of the two boards and their staff, for reactions and comments, covering purposes of the study, areas of concern to be investigated, specific issues and problems, and suggested procedures in pursuing the study. Interview guidelines were developed to assist interviewers, which helped to some degree in comparing responses of the several interviewers. Letters mailed to the membership announcing the project attempted to interpret the significance of the project and specified the kind of information which we felt we needed to make a sound judgment.

After a substantial part of the interviewing had been done, the Director prepared and mailed to registrants for the regional conferences a list of "Impressions Gained from the Interviews," in addition to analytical data on AAC and NCICU membership. Persons attending were invited to confirm or revise these impressions. We also submitted to the regional conferences a provisional document labeled "Assumptions and Implications," in which we indicated some tentative conclusions to which we seemed to be coming and explored the implications of those conclusions if they should turn out to be correct. For instance, one of the assumptions that seemed justified was that there needed to be a separate national voice and service organization for independent colleges and universities. Then we explored the kind of organization that might meet that need and the implications it would have for national representation of the liberal arts. These documents constituted the agenda for the seven regional conferences. They were held in New York (October 16), Pittsburgh (October 17), Chicago (October 21), Dallas-Fort Worth (October 22), Atlanta (October 27), Kansas City (October 29), and San Francisco (October 30).

These conferences, attended by about two hundred persons, turned out to be lively and productive. They were not routine repetitions but varied sharply in the predominant sentiment which seemed to characterize the participants. The emphasis seemed to shift from one conference to another, reflecting not only the prior positions of those in attendance but also the influence of effective spokesmen for one point of view or another. While all of the conferences reflected the prevailing judgment which we had earlier encountered in interviews that there was an urgent need for a separate voice for the independent sector, there was no such consensus with respect to how this should be achieved, or what its implications might be for the Association of American Colleges. A consensus would seem to emerge at one conference only to be rejected at the next one. What we did get was a thorough exploration of a host of alternatives for specific elements in any proposal we might make, with careful and even vigorous examination of the pros and cons. When we concluded our conferences we had gotten a clear confirmation of the need for a separate voice for the independent institutions, a mixed response with regard to the future role of a national liberal arts organization, and a variety of opinions on how to implement these findings. At least we had heard the pros and cons on a variety of options.

When the Advisory Committee met on November 14 the members had before them Dr. Gurin's initial analysis of the questionnaire and a document in which the Director tried to analyze what we had heard in the interviews and the regional conferences, and explored in some detail what appeared to be the major alternatives:

reconstituting AAC as the voice of the independents or establishing a new organization to be the national voice of the independent sector with the AAC continuing to perform the function of representing the liberal arts interests at the national level. Each of the alternatives was explored with some specificity in the preparatory documents and was debated comprehensively and extensively in the Advisory Committee. At the end a fair consensus appeared to have been reached at least with regard to the general purposes which any organization of independent institutions should seek to serve. The two liaison representatives from each of the two boards were present for this meeting.

Despite the extent of our inquiry and the care with which we have attempted to move toward clearly formulated accepted conclusions, it has not been possible to avoid subjective judgments with respect to a number of items. At some points we may be seeming to take some questionnaire findings more seriously and literally than others. Where this is the case it may be because of impressions gained from the interviews and the regional conferences. Nor should we overlook the strong possibility of honest differences of opinion on the meaning of the data gathered from any source.

We turn now to our findings.

Chapter IV. THE FINDINGS

Although our findings will draw on impressions gained from many personal contacts as well as from the questionnaire results, in the nature of the case it is easier to document findings with statistical data than with quotations from interviews. Since the questionnaire was constructed after a substantial amount of interviewing had been done and hence was to a considerable degree shaped by that direct input, we should not be surprised that the results from the questionnaire generally conform to the impressions gained from the interviews. Where there are deviations, or where the interviews and the regional conferences provided us with a frame of reference not available at the time the questionnaire was prepared, we have relied more heavily on the direct impressions gained out on the field.

The questionnaire has been analyzed by Dr. Gurin of the Survey Research Center using 1) the total responses on all items, 2) comparing AAC members and non-members, 3) comparing responses from public and independent institutions, 4) comparing institutions of different sizes, and 5) according to their choice of options for possible restructuring of national organizations. The latter analysis attempts to discover what the characteristics are of institutions that prefer one or the other of the alternatives. The significance of this for our findings will be explored at a later point.

The questionnaire was divided into six parts:

I. Background Information

II. Needed Services

III. Current Services of AAC and NCICU

IV. Overall Evaluation

V. Opinion Items

VI. Optional Structures

This section of the report will analyze the findings according to the above headings, comparing the results of various groups of respondents where there are significant differences. We will be utilizing the analysis prepared by Dr. Gurin, almost verbatim in many cases, and will take note of our own additions when these occur. Therefore we are generally omitting quotation marks, which could be so numerous as to be confusing.

Most of the respondents are college presidents (71%), 21% are other college officials, and 4% are state association directors. When comparing the institutions represented in the responses according to institutional control and size with the distribution of membership in the AAC and the NCICU as a whole there appears to be some underrepresentation of public institutions (5% of the responses compared to 8% of the total membership) and of institutions with less than 500 students (17% of the responses and 19% of the membership). Dr. Gurin observes that "these differences are slight, and there does not appear to be any serious bias in the characteristics of the institutions who responded to the questionnaire." We have noted earlier in this report that public institutions were somewhat overrepresented in the interviews (11% of the interviews and 8% of the total pool), which probably serves to offset any deficiency in the questionnaire sample in this regard.

Ninety-one percent of the responses came from independent institutions, 5% from public institutions, and 4% failed to identify themselves. Of the independents, 33% reported no religious affiliation, 22% were Roman Catholic, 36% Protestant, 3% other, while 7% did not respond.

Eighty-seven percent were members of a state independent college organization, 6% said they were not, and 7% failed to respond. Seventy-three percent were identified as members of AAC, 15% said they were not, and 8% failed to respond. Only 51% said they were members of NCICU, 34% said they were not members, and 16% made no response. Since, by definition, the membership of NCICU consists of all members of state associations and all independent members of AAC whether or not they are members of a state association, the only respondents who were in fact not members of NCICU were the public members who responded. While there are independent institutions that are not members of either a state association or AAC, and hence not members of NCICU, they did not receive the questionnaire since this was sent only to the members of the two organizations. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this information is that great confusion exists with regard to membership in NCICU. Because of this it was not possible to draw meaningful comparisons between members of AAC and members of NCICU. We did, however, develop comparisons between AAC members and non-members which may serve the same purpose.

Needed Services

The questionnaire listed 18 possible activities or services in which an institution might want to engage or have provided to

it. It asked respondents to rate them as 1) "not very important," 2) "somewhat important," 3) "very important," and 4) "imperative."* It also asked whether there are organizations on which they now depend for this service and offered three options for responses: 1) "Yes, some do it well," 2) "Yes, but not well," and 3) "No." A further request was made of those who chose the first response to identify the organization or organizations which they felt did it well.

The three services that rated at the top were as follows:

1. Providing a national voice for independent higher education. Sixty-four percent rated this "imperative" and 26% "very important," for a combined total of 90% in the two top categories. AAC members gave it a somewhat higher rating than non-members (a mean of 3.60 compared to 3.31). Public institutions understandably gave it a relatively lower rating (2.58) compared to independents as a whole (3.61). There was no significant difference based on size among the independent institutions (3.51 to 3.66).

2. Influencing public policy decisions in Congress. Fifty-eight percent rated this "imperative" and 32% "very important" for a total of 90% in these two top categories. Again AAC members lay slightly greater stress on this than non-members (mean of 3.56 compared to 3.28). On this the mean for public respondents is much nearer that of the independents (3.13 compared to 3.53). Again there is no difference among institutions based on size.

---

*Means are developed on a scale of 1-4, using these definitions.

3. Public image building for independent higher education. Forty-three percent consider this "imperative," which is considerably less in that category than in the two items already covered, but 43% consider it to be "very important," giving a combined total of 86% in these two top categories. Again AAC members considered this somewhat more important than non-members (3.34 compared to 3.10) and public respondents considered it considerably less important than independents (2.53 compared to 3.34). There was no significant difference based on the size of independent institutions.

The only other service which approached these in urgency in the minds of the respondents was "increased public relations to encourage private giving," which had 40% in the "imperative" category and 41% in the "very important" category, for a combined total of 81%. There is no difference between AAC members and non-members (3.21 compared to 3.16) and a modest but not significant difference based on size with the large institutions relying less on such general "image building." Public institutions consider it less important than private institutions (2.75 compared to 3.22).

There are a number of services which are viewed as "very important" by a relatively large proportion of the respondents but as "imperative" by relatively few. The following are illuminating and relevant.

1. Publications and image building about liberal arts. Only 17% consider this "imperative" but 43% consider it "very important." AAC members rate it slightly higher than non-members (2.78 to 2.44), while the differences based on the public-

independent designation are not significant. Small institutions consider it more important than large institutions (2.84 to 2.33).

2. Working with state associations and agencies. This is considered "very important" by 45% of the respondents, with 23% regarding it as "imperative." Here there is understandably a significant difference between public and independent respondents. AAC members consider it significantly more important than non-members (2.91 to 2.66). There is no difference on the basis of size.

3. Regular bulletins on current issues. This is regarded as "very important" by 52% but "imperative" by only 13%. There is no significant difference in the means by groups except that AAC members consider it somewhat more important than non-members.

4. Data gathering and analysis. It is considered "very important" by 47% but "imperative" by only 10%, with a somewhat higher mean for AAC members than non-members.

5. Analysis of educational policies (e.g. tenure, student rights). This is considered "very important" by 53% of the respondents, but "imperative" by only 7%, with the only difference among groups being the slightly higher rating given it by public members (2.94 to 2.61).

6. Faculty development activities. Considered "very important" by 49% and "imperative" by 9%. This appears to be most highly rated by independent institutions between 501-1100 enrollment.

7. Individual assistance to colleges on government relations. Forty-three percent considered this "very important" and 12% considered it "imperative." Independent institutions gave it a

significantly higher rating than public institutions (2.58 compared to 2.15) and institutions in the size category 2001 to 5000 expressed significantly less need for it than both smaller and larger institutions.

Other suggested services rated less than 50% of the responses in the combined totals of "imperative" and "very important." Those falling in this category were "communication between campuses," "working with court cases," "administrative training," "collective bargaining information and training," "research and information on faculty (e.g. women and governance)," "central legal staff to help member colleges," and "training in management techniques."

In commenting on the responses to this section of the questionnaire, the research staff notes that AAC members tend to feel a greater need for all of the services than do non-members but that they attach even more importance than non-members to the need for a "national voice" and "public image building" for independent higher education. When the public respondents are compared with the independent respondents they observe that, in addition to the expected greater concern for a national voice for the independent sector, independent institutions seem to feel a more general need for help with their external relationships and public image and influence. The public respondents express more need for assistance on issues involving internal relationships: collective bargaining, tenure, governance, etc.

Respondents were asked to list the three most critical services in the order of urgency. The percentage of total responses for the top ten are contained in Table 3. It will be noted that

Table 3

Most Critical Needed Services

		Most Critical Service (1)	Next Most Critical Service (2)	Third Most Critical Service (3)	Total (3)
		#	#	#	#
1.	Providing a national voice for independent higher education..	47	9	7	60
2.	Influencing public policy decisions in Congress.....	13	24	15	52
3.	Public image building for independent higher education.....	6	15	13	34
4.	Increased public relations to encourage private giving.....	8	14	9	31
5.	Data gathering and analysis.....	3	4	7	14
6.	Publications and image building about liberal arts.....	2	4	5	11
7.	Analysis of educational policies (e.g., tenure, student rights)..	1	4	5	10
8.	Working with state associations and agencies.....	1	3	5	9
9.	Individual assistance to colleges on government relations.....	2	2	4	8
10.	Faculty development activities..	2	3	3	8

with 18 options, 44% fixed on "a national voice for independent higher education" as most critical. If one adds to this the somewhat parallel concerns, "influencing public policy decisions in Congress" (13%) and "public image building for independent higher education" (6%), one will have accounted for 63% of the first choices, which with 11% not making a selection, has to be regarded as confirmation of the strong sense of urgency and the high priority given to this set of concerns. The next most frequent item is "increased public relations to encourage private giving" which garners 8% of the responses for most critical need.

There are, however, significant differences in many ratings when public respondents are compared with independent institutions.* For these comparisons we use a total percentage mentioning each service as either "most," "next most," or "third most critical service" (Table 4). A significant exception is that both public and independent respondents give virtually the same proportion (58% and 59%) to "influencing public policy decisions in Congress." Public institutions quite obviously feel less need for the services that relate directly to independent institutions, although there is some recognition of such need. Twenty-eight percent of the public respondents mention "providing a national voice for independent higher education," and 20% mention "public image building for independent higher education" as either the "most," "next most," or "third most critical service" needed. The corresponding figures for the independents are 69% and 38% respectively.

The questionnaire also asked whether any organization was performing each of the services, and if so, what organization.

*Percentage computations for total responses include all questionnaire respondents but comparative percentages for types of respondents are based on responses to the particular item only.

Table 4: Most Critical Needed Services

	Percentage Mentioning Each Service as "Most," "Next Most" or "Third Most Critical Service"	
	Public	Independent
1. Providing a national voice for independent higher education....	28%	69%
2. Increased public relations to encourage private giving.....	16%	36%
3. Publications and image building about liberal arts.....	12%	12%
4. Communications between campuses.	8%	2%
5. Public image building for independent higher education....	20%	38%
6. Regular bulletins on current issues (e.g., HENA).....	16%	5%
7. Influencing public policy decisions in Congress.....	58%	59%
8. Working with court cases.....	0%	5%
9. Working with state associations and agencies.....	8%	12%
10. Data gathering and analysis.....	36%	14%
11. Administrative training.....	12%	4%
12. Collective bargaining information and training.....	8%	2%
13. Analysis of educational policies on faculty (e.g., tenure, student rights).....	28%	11%
14. Research and information on faculty (e.g., women, governance)	24%	3%
15. Faculty development activities..	12%	9%
16. Individual assistance to colleges on government relations.....	4%	9%
17. Central legal staff to help members in colleges.....	8%	4%
18. Training in management techniques	4%	7%

The intention was to attempt to uncover deficiencies in service provisions as well as to ascertain the awareness of need.

If we focus on the three or four major needs for services which were identified above the responses are quite mixed. On the top concern, "providing a national voice for independent higher education," 40% answer "Yes, some do it well" but 34% answer "Yes, but not well," and 14% answer "No." The results are somewhat more negative on two other important items, "public image building for independent higher education" and "increased public relations to encourage private giving," on both of which only 23% feel they are being well served. If only the responses for independent institutions are taken into account the degree of satisfaction on these items increases to 46% on the first item and to 29% on each of the other two. On the other hand, on the item "influencing public policy decisions in Congress" the public institutions report a 48% rate for "Yes, some do it well" compared to 41% for the independents. By far the highest level of satisfaction appears to be connected with "regular bulletins on current issues (e.g HENA)" where 71% of the independents and 64% of the public respondents feel the service is being well performed.

It should also be observed that the degree of satisfaction in the four most critical areas noted is not less than in the case of other items, indeed in most cases the percentages are higher. For instance, "training in management techniques" gets only a 13% vote on "Yes, some do it well," compared to 40% for "providing a national voice for independent higher education" but only 4% of the respondents think the first rates an "imperative" description while 64% give that rating to the latter.

Those who identified the organizations that "do it well" most often pointed to AAC, then to NCICU, and then to ACE. A large number of organizations were mentioned a few times. Of the 40% who responded affirmatively on the first item, two out of three mentioned AAC, a little less than half mentioned NCICU, and one in six mentioned ACE. ACE was somewhat more important in "influencing public policy decisions in Congress" but still AAC and NCICU together constituted the majority of responses (with AAC mentioned about twice as often as NCICU). Dr. Gurin summarizes his analysis of the responses as follows:

> In general, then, except for a minimal role in facilitating "private giving," AAC and NCICU are very important for those people who feel that organizations are helping them with their most critically needed services. The issue does not seem to be that other organizations are satisfying important institutional needs that AAC and NCICU might be fulfilling; rather the issue seems to be that a majority of respondents feel that no organization is doing a good job in supplying these critical needs.

Or, we may add, performing them at a level of effectiveness commensurate with the urgency of need felt by the institutions.

Current Services of AAC and NCICU

The third section of the questionnaire tried to ascertain the degree of familiarity with services rendered and to get an evaluation of the manner in which they were being performed. They were asked to check one of five options on familiarity: 1) "not familiar with it," 2) "slightly familiar," 3) "familiar but have not used," 4) "have used occasionally," 5) "have used frequently." They were also asked to rate performance as 1) "poor," 2) "fair," 3) "good," 4) "excellent," and "no opinion." Fourteen

activities or programs were listed. They were also invited, in Section IV of the questionnaire, to give an overall evaluation of both the relevance of the activities and the performance level for both organizations.

Dr. Gurin notes that "among those who have some familiarity with a service and express an evaluation of it, the evaluations of the services are predominantly favorable." However, many of the services were not familiar to large numbers of the respondents. Dr. Gurin suggests this may mean that the presidents are not necessarily the best persons to fill out the questionnaire. It may also indicate the "project" character of some of the activities (e.g. the Bowen Indices Project was unknown to 63% of the respondents) and the specialized services involved, such as "workshops for state association directors" (unknown to 53% of the respondents).

On the other hand, 76% used "newsletters and information reports" either occasionally or frequently and rated the service between "good" and "excellent" (3.15); 67% had similar acquaintance with "publications" and rated them even higher (3.21). Even where large proportions had "no opinion" those who did characteristically rated performance at "good" or better on most items. Means of significantly less than "good" were recorded for "relations between institutions (sharing educational practises)," "information about state government activities," and "data gathering about institutions." AAC members are generally better informed about the activities of the organizations than non-members, as one would expect, and have slightly more favorable evaluations, although they are not statistically significant on any item

except "information on status of women in education" and "publications." For the most part the public members seem as positive in their evaluations as are the independents.

In the overall evaluation, judgments were solicited with respect to relevance and performance for both AAC and NCICU. On the first criterion members were offered four options: 1) "very relevant--focuses on issues crucial to my institution," 2) "fairly relevant," 3) "fairly irrelevant," 4) "very irrelevant--does not focus on crucial issues." The responses for both AAC and NCICU are predominantly 1 and 2, with a mean a good deal closer to "fairly relevant" than to "very relevant." Although NCICU seems to get a somewhat higher rating in this regard (a mean of 1.73 compared to 1.93), a substantial part of the 31% of the respondents who professed not to be members in fact are. Presumably their membership was not highly relevant to them.

On performance both organizations rate slightly better than "good" (AAC 2.14 and NCICU 2.20). While there are modest differences based on size, with the larger institutions giving a more positive appraisal than smaller institutions, there is no significant difference between public and independent respondents on either relevance or performance.

Opinion Items

The purpose of this part of the questionnaire was to focus the inquiry on specific points at issue, to cover items which had not found a place in previous sections, and to provide a means of testing our interpretations of responses in other parts of the instrument. Nineteen statements were submitted and respondents

were asked to check 1) "strongly disagree," 2) "disagree," 3) "no opinion," 4) "agree," 5) "strongly agree." The responses may be most helpful to us if we relate them to the findings we have already identified, and then seek to lift out any additional information or insights which could be useful.

Several of the opinion items relate more or less directly to the issue of whether or not there should be a strong separate spokesman for the independent sector. The responses quite clearly support that position. Seventy-six percent agreed with the statement, "What we really need is a strong separate spokesman for the independent sector," while only 10% disagreed. Another item asserted that "having both public and independent colleges in AAC subjects it to too many cross pressures about public policy issues"--62% agreed and 25% disagreed. There is understandably a different response from public and independent respondents on this point, with public members tending to disagree. Opinion is more evenly divided on the statement that "having both independent and public colleges in AAC is good; it improves communication," with 42% agreeing and 41% disagreeing. Here the public respondents tend to have a strong positive opinion and the independents a mild negative opinion.

While there is clearly a strong consensus on the need for a strong separate spokesman for the independent sector there is no clear consensus on who that spokesman should be. Thirty-eight percent agree that "NCICU should be that spokesman" while 19% disagree (31% no opinion). Thirty-six percent agree with the statement that "AAC should be that spokesman" while 28% disagree

(26% no opinion). When it is proposed that "lobbying in Washington for independent higher education should be AAC's prime task," 41% agree and 34% disagree. Here again there is a marked difference between public and independent respondents (2.65 to 3.16), but no significant difference among other categories. There is no predominant view that a special focus on the independent sector implies separating NCICU from AAC, with 25% agreeing and 23% disagreeing with the view that "NCICU should be entirely separated from AAC." On this item public respondents do not differ from independents.

Another set of opinion items relate to the role of AAC in the area of liberal education. Three of them asked for opinions about AAC's activities as spokesman for liberal education. In general, the responses suggest a favorable view, although a sizable minority expresses reservations. Forty-five percent disagree with the statement that "the liberal education emphasis of AAC is too vague to be useful," while 32% agree. Forty-four percent agree that "liberal education is effectively represented by AAC," while 23% disagree. Fifty-nine percent disagree that "Liberal Education is too narrow, focuses too much on liberal arts" and only 14% agree. On all three items the opinion of public respondents is more positive than the independents, and in two of the cases the difference is statistically significant. There are no significant differences based on size or membership status.

The questionnaire does not offer a great deal of information on the extent of concern for the liberal arts in the responding institutions. Clearly it does not rank as a consideration comparable to the concern for a national voice for the independent

sector. "Publications and image building about liberal arts" receives only 2% of the votes as the "most critical service" needed, 4% for "next most" and 5% in the "third most" category. But 17% gave it an "imperative" rating and 43% called it "very important." Liberal Education gets an impressive endorsement, as noted above, and the 44% positive response compared to a 23% negative response on "liberal education is effectively represented by AAC" implies both interest in the field and confidence in the agency which represents it. Forty-two percent endorse the media public relations efforts of AAC and NCICU while only 12% find it not helpful.

Our impression from the interviews and the regional conferences is that the liberal arts interest tends to be fully as strong in public institutions as in independent ones, although this impression may be partly the result of the fact that our contacts on public campuses tended to be with deans and vice presidents for academic affairs, while our contacts at independent institutions tended to be presidents. The impression is at least partially supported by the modest margin public institutions held in the questionnaire (2.84 to 2.69) in response to "publications and image building about liberal arts" as an important need. As many independent institutions--especially the smaller ones having greatest enrollment problems--have developed new programs to attract students, they have tended to shift their focus toward the prevailing career orientation. There is still a very strong interest in liberal education (arts and sciences) in the independent sector especially among more stable institutions, but it has come to be submerged in the more urgent question of survival even for many of those institutions.

Three items solicited opinions on the annual meeting of AAC. Here the reactions were clearly more positive than negative. This confirms strong impressions gained from the interviews. The meetings provide useful information (49%), facilitate exchanging ideas with similar institutions (56%), and provide enrichment for college leaders (40%). It succeeds in getting a positive response from all categories of size and appears to be even more important to public respondents than to others. Members, of course, found it more useful than non-members.

The focus of the organizations is properly on federal relations, rather than state government activities, 58% rejecting the statement that there is "too much stress on federal government relations." There is some concern about the attention paid to the needs of small colleges. Thirty-four percent agree that "AAC and NCICU have really neglected the needs of very small colleges," while only 31% disagree. As one would expect, non-members and small institutions come down rather heavily on this, while members of public institutions tend to disagree.

On the other hand, all sizes and types of institutions support having 2-year, 4-year, and graduate institutions participate in AAC and NCICU. On the question of whether the organization should have subgroups for special colleges such as single sex, large and small institutions, etc., 37% agree and 31% disagree. Twenty-six percent of the members say they would be willing to pay modest extra dues for such a special subgroup and 39% reject the proposal. While independent institutions are more interested in this option than public institutions (2.77 to 2.35), there is no significant difference either by size of institution or on the

basis of member and non-member designation.

Options for Restructuring AAC and NCICU

The questionnaire described five options for meeting the needs for services utilizing existing organizations (AAC and NCICU) or adapting and changing them in order to meet the needs more efficiently and effectively. It asked respondents to rank the five options in the order of their preference. It also listed "possible strengths" and "possible weaknesses," asking each respondent to check the one strength and one weakness which carried the greatest weight with the respondent. These were added in part to help explain to the respondent something about the issues presumed to be involved in each option so that he could make a more meaningful ranking, and in part to provide information on why persons made the rankings which they did--what were the governing factors in the appraisal being made.

There was an introductory paragraph to the entire section which explained why these options were being considered, and brief descriptive comments about those options which might not be familiar to the general reader.

The five options were as follows:

A. Maintain the current relations between AAC and NCICU.

B. Strengthen NCICU's budget, staff, and decision-making position, but retain the relationship between them.

C. Consolidate AAC and NCICU, forming an organization that would serve as the professional and legislative representative of the independent sector, with anticipated withdrawal of the public members.

D. Make NCICU the surviving organization representing independent higher education, with AAC terminating

and NCICU retaining as much of its liberal arts interests as members saw fit.

E. Form two separate organizations: AAC continuing to be concerned with academic, professional and administrative problems of all liberal arts units, public and independent. NCICU "would become a separate association functioning as the legislative representative and advocate of the entire independent sector with special interests in the small independent institutions." It might add related programs, such as public relations.

We will first examine the rankings of the options. Table 5 reports the complete data for all respondents, Table 6 gives a comparison of rank 1 and rank 5 and mean rank for public and independent institutions and for members and non-members of AAC. Table 7 gives rank 1 and mean rank by size of institution. Note that Table 5 includes those who did not respond to this item, whereas Tables 6 and 7 give percentages for those who made a choice.

It will be noted that there is sharp divergence between public and independent institutions in the way they rank the options, with public institutions being much more satisfied with the present arrangement than are independent members (50% compared to 10%). The first choice seems clearly to be "consolidate AAC and NCICU" which receives 50% of the rank 1 designations of independents, 38% of the total respondents, 51% of the AAC members, 43% of the non-members, and from 40% to 56% based on size. The option getting the second largest vote for rank 1 is "form two separate organizations." Here the differences between public and independent responses disappears (24% public, 24% independent); non-members are slightly more favorable than members, and very small and large institutions are more favorable than institutions

Table 5

Ranking of Five Options on AAC-NCICU Relations (all respondents)

(Percentages given are percent of total respondents to questionnaire, not percent of those who responded to this item.)

	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Rank 5	No response	Mean Rank
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
A. Maintain the current relations between AAC and NCICU.....	8	17	15	12	22	25	3.31
B. Strengthen NCICU's budget, staff and decision-making process..	10	20	20	20	4	26	2.84
C. Consolidate AAC and NCICU.....	38	11	15	10	4	22	2.11
D. Make NCICU the surviving organization.....	5	19	11	17	23	26	3.46
E. Form two separate organizations.....	18	10	13	1[illegible]	19	26	3.09

Table 6

Ranking of Five Options of AAC-NCICU Relations

(Percentages given are percent of those responding to this item.)

(public-independent)	Rank 1		Rank 5		Mean Rank		
	Public	Independent	Public	Independent	Public	Independent	t-test
A. Maintain the current relations between AAC and NCICU.....	50%	10%	0%	31%	1.82	3.38	5.27***
B. Strengthen NCICU's budget, staff and decision-making process....	10%	14%	5%	6%	2.95	2.83	0.45
C. Consolidate AAC and NCICU..	20%	50%	5%	5%	2.75	2.09	2.29
D. Make NCICU the surviving organization.....	0%	7%	70%	29%	4.50	3.42	3.60***
E. Form two separate organizations.....	24%	24%	19%	26%	2.86	3.10	0.70

(member--non-member)	Rank 1		Rank 5		Mean Rank		
	AAC	Not AAC	AAC	Not AAC	AAC	Not AAC	t-test
A. Maintain the current relations between AAC and NCICU.....	12%	7%	26%	36%	3.20	3.57	2.01*
B. Strengthen NCICU's budget, staff and decision-making process....	13%	18%	6%	6%	2.83	2.93	0.64
C. Consolidate AAC and NCICU..	51%	43%	5%	6%	2.08	2.26	1.09
D. Make NCICU the surviving organization.....	5%	10%	32%	26%	3.55	3.16	2.33*
E. Form two separate organizations.....	24%	27%	27%	27%	3.13	2.93	0.99

***p=0.001 *p=0.05

Table 7

Ranking of Five Options on AAC-NCICU Relations (by size)

(Percentages given are percent of those respondeint to this item.)

	Rank 1					Mean Rank					
	Under 500	501 - 1,100	1,101 - 2,000	2,001 - 5,000	Over 5,000	Under 500	501 - 1,100	1,101 --2,000	2,001 - 5,000	Over 5,000	F-Test
A. Maintain the current relations between AAC and NCICU.....	7%	11%	11%	7%	12%	3.23	3.27	3.20	3.45	3.97	2.42
B. Strengthen NCICU's budget, staff and decision-making process..	10%	15%	13%	16%	12%	2.80	2.80	2.77	2.96	2.94	0.43
C. Consolidate AAC and NCICU.....	47%	51%	56%	49%	40%	2.29	2.00	2.09	2.14	2.11	0.72
D. Make NCICU the surviving organization.....	7%	5%	6%	7%	6%	3.47	3.54	3.55	3.32	2.97	1.74
E. Form two separate organizations.....	29%	24%	19%	24%	32%	2.99	3.12	3.21	3.16	2.91	0.38

between 501 and 5000. It should be noted that about as many respondents give option E a rank of 5 as a rank of 1. When mean ranks are compared, second place goes to option B, "strengthen NCICU's budget, staff, and decision-making position." This is because while it receives fewer rank 1 choices it gets the largest number of rank 2 and rank 3 choices and very few rank 5.

When we turn to the lowest rank choices, "make NCICU the surviving organization" (option D) and "maintain the current relations between AAC and NCICU" (option A) have the largest number, except in the case of the public members who prefer the current relationship above all the others. Twenty-three percent of total responses give option D rank 5, and 22% give option A that rank. Among independents 31% assign rank 5 to option A and 29% to option D. AAC members assign 32% to option D and 26% to option A, while non-members reverse the order, giving 36% to option A and 26% to option D.

If there is a surprise in these results it has to be the relative unattractiveness of the NCICU as the sole national representative of the concerns which are now represented by the AAC. How is one to account for it? From the interviews it is clear that virtually without exception state associations receive very high marks from their member institutions. Since most of the members of NCICU come into that organization by virtue of their membership in a state association one might have expected a similar positive appraisal of the NCICU. One cannot account for it by the acknowledged concern about more organizations, since as projected NCICU would replace AAC. Neither does it reflect a proportionately less favorable judgment on the services provided

since in the overall evaluation of AAC and NCICU both organizations are given favorable marks. Moreover, parallel opinion items seem to give the nod to NCICU over AAC as the independent sector spokesman. Seventy-six percent agree with the statement that "What we really need is a strong separate spokesman for the independent sector" while only 12% disagreed. Thirty-six percent agreed and 28% disagreed (24% no opinion) with the statement "AAC should be the independent sector spokesman," while 38% agreed and only 19% disagreed (31% no opinion) with the statement "NCICU should be the independent sector spokesman." Among those who felt competent to express an opinion, the NCICU appeared to have a modest advantage.

It is difficult to know to what extent the complex relationships between AAC and NCICU and the ambiguity about membership, reflected in the rather high percentage of respondents who were unaware of their membership in NCICU, relate to these choices. It seems probable that they would affect the selection of NCICU as the surviving agency negatively. A review of the suggested "possible strengths" and "possible weaknesses" may provide some clues. Fifty-three percent felt that a possible weakness was "that this option would mean abandonment at the national level of a coordinated effort to promote and strengthen liberal arts education." Fifty-three percent also recognized as a possible strength that "a strengthened advocacy position" would clearly predominate in NCICU. Apparently they felt that kind of representation could be found also in other options. What they did not want to do was to abandon at the national level "a coordinated effort to promote and strengthen liberal arts education."

While option B, "strengthen NCICU's budget, staff, and decision-making position" gets a middle rating, it ranks far behind C and E in the first choices which it gets, especially among AAC member respondents, and more especially among institutions under 500 and above 5000.

When one looks at the responses to see what considerations were considered to be significant strengths or weaknesses, he finds some further light on why the rankings occurred. It is apparent that every option is being considered primarily in terms of the overriding concern about a national voice for the independent sector. Each respondent was asked to identify one strength and one weakness in each case which he considered most important. The weaknesses of maintaining the current relationship are "the mixture of public and independent colleges may compromise AAC's position when legislation is pending that affects each sector differently (31%)," and "does not provide for a single strong voice for independent higher education (38%)." Fifty-eight percent see as a strength in option B (strengthening NCICU but retaining AAC) that "NCICU's role as advocate for the private sector could be placed in a more prominent position," while 45% see as a major weakness that "this option might not provide sufficient response to the call for a single voice for the independent sector." The overwhelming strength (62%) of option C (consolidating AAC and NCICU) is that "a single independent higher education organization representing the interests and needs of that sector should exercise maximum impact on government, other educational associations, and the public."

Another consideration is clearly the matter of cost. Indeed, the questionable reference to some relationship between having two organizations and increased costs to institutions may have been a major deterrent in the rankings of option E, since that was the only option which made any reference to costs. Fifty-five percent checked this as the major weakness in this option. The reference is questionable because while separate organizations probably would cost more than the current cost of AAC, it does not necessarily follow that the additional personnel and services contemplated for the separate organization would cost more than if they were to be added to AAC. The assumption that cost was a major consideration with regard to this option is supported also by the rather low vote (17%) given to the possible "eventual decline and demise of AAC" in connection with this option compared to the very high rating given "abandonment at the national level of a coordinated effort to promote and strengthen liberal arts education (53%)" as a weakness in connection with option D (making NCICU the surviving organization). In that case the choice was between the improbability of foundation support for the organization and concern for a voice for liberal arts and liberal arts dominated; with respect to option E the choice was between cost and the future of AAC, and cost clearly was determinative.

In an attempt to further understand the considerations involved in the rankings, we asked the research team to see whether they could characterize more precisely those respondents who gave high and low rankings to option C (consolidate AAC and NCICU) and option E (separate AAC and NCICU), because these appeared to be the two preferred alternatives. We also asked them to look at

option D (make NCICU the surviving organization) which was the lowest ranking option to see whether any correlations could be discovered which would throw light on why NCICU was considered an unacceptable successor to AAC if a single organization were to survive. For this purpose they correlated questionnaire responses with the ranking of the various options.

They found that only a small number of responses were highly correlated with the ranking of the options but that those which were statistically significant presented a clear and consistent picture and made sense in terms of the particular option. Thus there was a clear relationship between a high ranking of either option C or option E and the emphasis on the need for a strong national voice for the independent sector. The overall mean for all respondents on this question was 4.18 (on a five point scale) and for the independent sector respondents it was 4.23, while those who gave option C rank 1 gave it a 4.37 rating and those who ranked it fifth gave it 3.73; the comparable figures for option E were 4.46 and 4.11, and for option D they were 4.53 and 3.79. Clearly, those who feel strongly on this point tended to choose one of the three options, but it does not by itself explain the relatively high rating of options C and E and the very low rating of option D. Those who prefer two separate organizations and those who want to have AAC wholly composed of independent members give relatively more weight to the argument that "having both public and independent colleges in the AAC subjects it to too many cross pressures about public policy issues" than the respondents in general (mean for option E 3.65, option C 3.74, general 3.45), but

those who chose option D gave this even more weight (mean 4.13). Also the difference in means for those who ranked each of these options first and those who ranked it fifth is considerable, but it is greater in the case of option D than in either of the other two.

The choice between these options appears to have been made on other grounds than the priority given to the need for a separate national spokesman for the independent sector. There is a rather high correlation between the ranking of options and the evaluation of current services of AAC and NCICU. Those giving a high ranking to two separate organizations tend to be somewhat more critical of the performance of AAC and NCICU, they are somewhat less impressed by the annual meetings of AAC, and they agree less with the statement that AAC has been an effective spokesman for liberal education. Those who give option D a high ranking are uniformly more critical in their evaluations than the general respondent, while those who give it a low rating are consistently higher in their evaluation than the general respondent. It would appear that a major factor in the rankings is the judgment with regard to the relevance and performance of AAC, and the top ranking given to the reconstituting of AAC as the voice of the independents must be regarded as a favorable vote on both counts--relevance and performance. The low rating given to option D, the only one of the options which contemplated in effect the termination of AAC, further confirms that interpretation.

What conclusions are we to draw with regard to these various alternatives? We believe that the questionnaire supports our impressions from the interviews and the regional conferences that

there are two alternatives that would be acceptable to the general membership. The apparent preference among independent institutions is for the consolidation of AAC and NCICU into a single organization with independent members only, retaining a strong concern for the liberal arts, and presumably finding other ways to cooperate with the public sectors in areas of common concern, including liberal arts. This would be genuinely regretted by the public respondents, although it is our impression from interviews and discussions that they would understand that action and that it would not result in any serious fracturing of relations between the public and the independent sector. As noted previously, there have been parallels where organizations that ha[illegible]oth public and independent members have reorganized to serve their public members better. The most obvious instance is the transformation of the American Association of Teacher Education Institutions into the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in 1961.

The other alternative is to separate the two concerns--the national voice for the independent sector and the concern for the liberal arts--and allow each of them to develop the structure and program which is most congenial with its objectives, and to develop its affiliations on the basis of the respective interests of each. It would not then be necessary for two legitimate first priorities to contend with one another for the time and resources of either organization. It may be that an AAC with liberal arts as its central and uncontested interest will relate most naturally to such organizations as the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, the American Conference of Academic Deans, various commissions of

other national groups, perhaps also professional organizations in certain fields, and the entire spectrum of humanities and arts agencies and activities. An organization with the central and uncontested ambition to represent the independent sector may find itself re-asserting relations with the Independent College Funds of America, and may find ways of developing coalitions for political action with agencies that are not wholly educational, as well as with coordinate educational groups.

The data gathered through the questionnaire, like the interviews and the regional conferences, have left us with an inescapable residue of issues unresolved. They have been illuminated and clarified but there is no clear mandate on many aspects of the problems with which we have been wrestling, except for this: Provision must be made for a separate and strong voice to represent the independent sector.

Miscellaneous Observations

Some additional impressions gained largely from interviews and regional conferences deserve comment. They did not lend themselves readily to quantifiable measurement and were not covered by the questionnaire.

1. The concern among independent institutions for a single and separate national voice does not imply primary concern with anticipated federal financial resources coming to the institutions. When we asked in the interviews whether substantial increases in federal funding were expected, we generally got negative responses. Most persons said they expected adjustments for inflation and some increase in student assistance, but no major new programs

of institutional or categorical aid and no substantial changes in the financing patterns of higher education. In many cases they personally favored higher levels of federal support, but this too was hedged with qualifiers such as "if it is the right kind," or "depending on what conditions are attached to it." Even though no additional dollars were to be forthcoming, institutions would feel that a national voice representing their concerns would be very important in helping to shape policies and regulations with regard to existing programs. Indeed, there seemed often to be more focus on administrative departments than on the Congress. This showed up also in the almost universal concern and uneasiness about the negative impact of federal requirements relating to other than support programs. It was felt that regulations drawn for universal application are frequently inappropriate for the independent sector, or at the very least that a strong representation to rule-making bodies is needed to assure that they are not prejudicial to such institutions.

2. It was our impression that there is genuine reluctance to take any action which would have, or would seem to have, a negative effect on the relations between public and independent institutions. Those who preferred the status quo obviously did it on the grounds of common interests between public and independent members, especially at the national level. Those who preferred one of the options that would not include public members expressed concern that cooperative relations should be established with public counterparts, and those who favored an option that included public members regarded that fact as a major argument in support of their view. The sense of partnership in a common task involving

state-sponsored and independent institutions in a common public task is very strong. In no sense is the strong vote given for a separate national voice for the independents to be construed as an "anti-public sector" vote.

3. While all institutions are in the mood to trim membership payments and hence are looking for memberships to drop, we have the impression that most of them would be willing to pay something more for the additional services anticipated from a reorganization of their national representation. When they were asked the question directly in the interviews, most responses were either positive or conditionally positive--yes, if they felt the activity was effective. When we posed questions of amount--in relation to their contribution to their state association, for instance, we characteristically got reactions which implied "more, but not that much." Clearly, no one wants to spend more on memberships than is necessary, and all will expect a rigorous accounting.

4. While there is no way of knowing for sure whether the 39% who did not respond to the questionnaire would have responded in the same way as the 61% who did respond, some indication of differences may be gathered by comparing late respondents with early respondents. Early respondents were more familiar with the services of AAC and NCICU and seemed significantly more concerned about a separate voice for the independent sector. Dr. Gurin notes that except for these differences "early and late respondents answered the questions very similarly," and believes that "our respondents are probably not strikingly different from those who did not complete the questionnaire.

Chapter V. RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the design of this study major responsibility for making recommendations was given to the staff. The content of the recommendations which follow has been the subject of thorough discussion in the Advisory Committee, but responsibility for their formulation, as well as the final choices on a number of items explicit or implicit in their formulation, must be borne by the Director and the two Associate Directors.

Recommendations I-IX below relate to the establishment of a separate organization to represent the special interests of the independent institutions. Recommendations X-XII relate to some revisions in emphasis and structure of the Association of American Colleges. Recommendations XIII-XIV relate to procedures for implementation.

I. We recommend that a separate national organization be established to represent independent colleges and universities.

The single inescapable conclusion to which our investigation points is that there must be a separate national organization to represent independent colleges and universities. While there is some contrary opinion, it is our judgment that between 80% and 90% of those who participated in the study hold this view.

It does not automatically follow that such a national organization needs to be established. It could be the AAC, without public members. As we have indicated, there would be precedent for such a reorganization, leaving out independent members. At least on the surface, this seems to be the option which ranks first among the

respondents to the questionnaire. We have indicated in the discussion of those findings why we think the advantage which that option seems to have in voting has to be scrutinized closely on the basis of the weight given to listed strengths and weaknesses. The heavy weight given to the assumed additional cost of two separate organizations, when taken with some of the other data, strongly suggests that without that inference the ranking would have been much more nearly even. Nonetheless, we cannot argue that there is a clear mandate from the questionnaire results, the interviews, or the regional conferences to the effect that only a new and separate voice for the independent institutions will comply with the clear mandate for a separate voice. We believe our recommendation is consistent with the data we have at hand, though not necessarily the only recommendation that could claim to be consistent with that data.

That we have opted for the establishment of an organization which could be shaped and structured to fit the requirements of the representational function is the result of our own wrestling with the issues involved, the identification of substantial support for the liberal arts, the reactions to a whole range of possibilities experienced first hand in discussions with many people, and some convictions which we have about the future which we are constrained to affirm. The following are illustrative of the considerations that we have taken into account.

1. Basic educational issues ought not to be subordinated to some other issue and earn a place on the agenda "to the extent that" they are relevant to federal relations or fund-raising or some other

special interest. There should be someplace where the educational agenda can be determined by the nature of education, not solely by the problems of educational institutions.

2. If federal relations were to be established as the first priority of the AAC, we see the probability of continuing competition between federal relations and liberal arts and consequent ambiguity as to which is the first priority, and probably continued uneasiness as to whether the independent sector actually does have a national voice geared to federal relations. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that federal relations might become such a dominant consideration that liberal arts would be almost totally obscured, which we think would be unfortunate.

3. A few years down the road we believe that the non-vocational aspects of education will seem far more relevant and important than they do now. The AAC should not only be around then but should help hasten that day.

4. A new organization could be established quite quickly, without complicated questions relating to assets and constitutional amendments. It would take a year to effect the necessary changes in the AAC constitution, and the call for a separate voice is urgent. If there were obvious gains anticipated from the reorganization of AAC, the delay would be tolerable, but in our judgment that is not the case.

5. Even though it would be possible for a reconstituted AAC to enter into cooperative relations with NASULGC, AASCU, and AACJC, and other organizations, we think that an organization whose top priority is federal relations is much less likely to take the

initiative in such cooperative activities than is one whose top priority is liberal arts and which has in its membership both public and private institutions.

6. We believe that a national organization devoted to basic educational issues is viable. We were impressed by the amount of support which exists for the liberal arts, as reflected in the interviews, regional conferences, and the questionnaire results.

Several of these considerations are discussed at somewhat greater length in connection with Recommendation X.

The arguments which have been advanced against a separate voice for the independent sector are 1) that interests at the federal level do not divide into public and independent, but rather into large and small institutions, single-purpose or multi-purpose institutions, etc., 2) that even where the interests do divide on the basis of public or independent, it is to the interest of the independents to negotiate their differences with the publics because they are outnumbered, and 3) it is not possible to find a single position on public policy acceptable to the whole range of independent institutions which could be represented by a national organization.

We think that the implication of a national voice for the independent sector goes beyond the separate, and often distinctive, interests of individual institutions or groups of institutions. It relates to the larger issues of the public-private way of providing public services to which we alluded in an earlier section of this report. Moreover, the experience in the several states has been that it is both necessary and possible to find a common ground for

the independent institutions as a whole and we are not persuaded that the situation at the national level is fundamentally different. Many state associations have to accommodate as large a range of interests in representing their institutions as would be required of a national organization.

The argument for a separate national voice for the independent sector in the field of public policy does not assume that positions taken will always be distinctive--and even in conflict with--those taken by representatives of the public sector. Indeed, it may be assumed that they most often will be mutually supportive. What is needed is a body which will ascertain what positions are of interest to the independent sector, when they are distinctive, and, in either case, what ought to be done about it. The failure to have a forum in which these decisions are made by all elements in the independent sector makes for uncertainty about where their real interests are and timidity in declaring them. One should expect a stronger voice for the general concerns of higher education, as well as a strong voice for specific interests of the independent sector. As several persons put it in our interviews, "We compromise too early in the negotiations with others when we do not have negotiations first among ourselves." This opportunity needs to be provided.

II. We recommend that the national organization for the independent institutions have the following purposes.

1. To provide a unified voice for the independent sector in higher education.

2. To develop understanding of and appreciation for the role of the independent sector in higher education among the general public.

3. To keep the independent sector informed and aware of government programs and actions, in effect or contemplated.

4. To be a channel through which the independent sector expresses its concerns and exercises its influence on public policy decisions at the national level.

5. To develop policy positions in behalf of the independent sector and to support them with adequate research and documentation.

6. To cooperate with other national groups in promoting public policies of joint concern.

7. To provide services to state associations of independent colleges and universities.

8. To provide such services to institutions and groups of institutions as may be needed.

We do not expect that all of these purposes can be implemented immediately. It will take time, for instance, to develop the research capability which may be necessary for full documentation of positions taken, and we believe that it would be wise for the organizations to seek to utilize other research capabilities on a contract basis--certainly on a temporary and perhaps on a permanent basis. We think that the organization should move slowly in providing institutional services and should, wherever possible, lean on other organizations for such services. We have in mind, for instance, the use of capabilities which already exist in the AAC or in the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. There may, however, be specific needs which are unmet and which the NAICU would be best qualified to provide. At least, at the outset and for the near future we would see almost exclusive focus on the part of NAICU on representational functions.

III. We recommend that the basic membership unit be institutions. We have considered carefully the alternative of an association

made up of state associations. It is an attractive option in many respects. It would build into the national organization the dynamism which already exists in the state associations. It would virtually assure a membership equivalent to the combined membership of the state associations. It might provide a simple assessment of dues formula related to state collections and implemented through the state associations.

Nonetheless, we have not found this option generally supported in the campus interviews nor the regional conferences. To the extent that the questionnaire provides data on the matter it seems to be more negative than positive. Indeed, the fact that scarcely more than half of those who actually are members of NCICU, by virtue of their being members of a state association, were aware of this relationship argues strongly against any sort of indirect membership in the new organization.

Another variant of this which has been proposed is that membership should transfer automatically from the state association to the new organization, with other institutions eligible to join independently. This has many of the same advantages and disadvantages as using the state associations as building blocks. We encountered considerable resistance to the idea that membership in one organization should somehow be conditional on membership in another organization. In this case, we feel that the expressed interest in a separate national organization for the independent sector is so strong that it should not require any additional devices to insure an adequate membership base. We agree that it is important that there should be as little disparity as possible between those who belong and those who benefit.

To be effective at the national level there needs to be a strong sense of direct involvement on the campus and this requires that the decision to join be made on the campus and that local administrators be aware of the costs involved. We believe that the state associations also need to be involved, as will be indicated later, and if an arrangement could be worked out whereby state associations would pay dues of member institutions, if they wished to do so, the process might be both more simple and more effective. We believe that the organization would do well to examine this possibility as an option for members.

IV. We recommend that the organization be called the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Its name should indicate the comprehensive character of its membership, including graduate and professional education. "National" seems more appropriate than "American" since membership will be limited to institutions in the United States.

V. We recommend that the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities be governed by a board of twenty-one members, representative of its membership, recognizing differences in size and purpose of institutions, types of institutional sponsors, geographical distribution, and any other factors deemed to differentiate significantly among the members.

We believe that a relatively large board is needed to give a genuine sense of participation to the various segments of its membership. We believe that state association executives should be eligible for election to the Board and that the Board should normally include such a member or members. We considered very seriously the desirability of establishing a formula which would ensure representation from state associations (either executives or board chairmen) as well as from identifiable components within

the membership. We were dissuaded from recommending such a formula by discussions in the regional conferences. Considerations against it were that the qualifications of the person were more important than the representation of a segment of the membership, and that it is preferable to have guidelines for nominations rather than membership categories in elections. While at the outset there was considerable concern for designated representatives from the state associations, this seemed to disappear in the course of the study and a number of association directors expressed themselves in favor of electing all board members at large, providing it was clear that directors were eligible for membership. This is the course we are recommending.

There was also some interest in the possibility of bringing other groups of independent institutions into the comprehensive national organization through representation on the Board. Arguments advanced in support of such an arrangement were to the effect that the dynamic and initiative and cooperation of such organizations would be needed and could be insured through such an arrangement. On the other hand, it was felt that this would in effect provide duplicate representation for those members who belonged to such organizations. If they shared in the election of all board members they would be represented to the same degree as others, but if they also had a representative from a second organization to which they belonged they would have additional representation, not available to others. It seems to us, therefore, that every effort should be made to draw nominees from a wide spectrum, taking into account the considerations noted, but not specifying any allocation of places on the Board.

VI. We recommend that the Board of NAICU regard the Association of State Directors as a particular source of information, initiatives, and proposals for action, and that it develop mechanisms for bringing the same to the Board for its periodic consideration and action.

As persons whose full-time attention and energy are devoted to public policy questions and related needs at the state level, with substantial federal involvement, the state directors need to be tied into the activities of NAICU in such a manner that their expertise is available and focused on national issues, and so that the dynamism of the state associations can express itself nationally. We believe that this is most likely to happen if the state directors as a group, acting through their own organization, can be linked effectively to the activities of the national organization.

VII. We recommend that the Board of NAICU further establish effective liaison with organizations representing groups of independent colleges at the national level.

We have in mind such organizations as those representing national denominational groups, the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, the National Council of Independent Junior Colleges, the Independent College Funds of America, the American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities, and similar organizations. There are clearly limits to the possibility of accommodating the national organization to the interests of regional consortia or highly specialized national units and we do not recommend that this be attempted.

The guiding principle should be to maximize the influence of the national organization by cooperation in planning and implementing appropriate federal initiatives, and to increase the

effectiveness of federal relations in behalf of all independent colleges and universities. This should not mean, of course, that such groups necessarily waive their right to disagree with positions that may be taken and to make their dissent known through other channels than NAICU. We would hope and expect that such instances would be exceptional. Conversely, it should not imply any obligation on the part of NAICU to limit itself to positions acceptable to all such liaison groups.

VIII. We recommend that a dues structure be established which relates payments to probable benefits and ability to pay. Dues should be assessed to institutions and normally paid directly to the national organization.

In many ways it would be desirable to have the state associations directly involved in the financing of the national organization. A number of state associations have suggested that the national dues could be assessed to state associations, perhaps collected as a percentage of state dues, and thus assure total membership of their institutions in the national organization.

We do not recommend this as a general policy, at least at the outset. Our reason for not recommending indirect financing through the state associations is much the same as for not using them as the component parts of the national organization. We believe that institutions need to be aware of their membership and of their responsibilities for its support in both personal and financing terms. However, we see merit in allowing the institutions in a state to elect to use their state association as the vehicle for collecting membership dues. It could even be advantageous to allow a modest discount for such group entries into membership and group handling of dues, to increase institutional memberships.

In spite of financial stringency and the desire to reduce membership costs, we do not believe that any significant number of state association members will stay out of a national organization with similar purposes. The almost universal sense of urgency which we have encountered with regard to the establishment of a national organization for these purposes certainly implies the willingness to carry the costs.

Eventually the NAICU should move toward a dues structure which would relate a portion of the dues to enrollment since federal benefits are likely to bear such a general relationship. We suggest that 50 to 60 percent of the budget might be allocated equally among member institutions with the balance allocated according to enrollment. Initially, however, we propose a dues structure which makes modest distinctions on the basis of size and which seeks to hold membership payments for both AAC and NAICU close to current AAC levels at least for smaller institutions.

IX. We recommend that the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities be organized under legal provisions which will give it necessary flexibility to carry on its activities in federal relations, as well as to carry on such other functions as may be appropriate.

It is our understanding that NAICU should be a 501 (c) 4 agency in order not to be subject to undue restrictions on its federal relations activity. While this does not automatically make the agency ineligible to receive grants, it may be found desirable to establish a parallel 501 (c) 3 organization which is clearly eligible to receive grants and gifts as many state associations have done. While it would theoretically be entirely possible for some other organization, including AAC, to serve in that capacity, we believe that it would probably be inadvisable.

It would be advantageous for the two organizations to have the same membership and parallel structures.

While it is not impossible that an organization with the purposes listed under Recommendation II could be given 501 (c) 3 status, we believe that it would have greater flexibility in pursuing those purposes with a 501 (c) 4 designation.

X. We recommend that AAC continue with both public and independent members, and with certain revisions in emphasis and structure.

Theoretically it would be possible to transform the AAC into an organization which could perform the functions described for the NAICU, by eliminating the public members. As indicated in the previous chapter, there are precedents for this in reverse, and we do not believe that it needs to be rejected out of hand because of anticipated reactions from the public membership. This is clearly an option which is open and which may be taken by the Board of AAC if it sees fit to do so. We have debated the matter at great length, on campuses, in regional conferences, in the Advisory Committee, and within the staff. We believe we are aware of nearly all the considerations that could be taken into account in forming a judgment.

It is our conclusion that there is an important role for AAC to play in the future, quite apart from the kinds of questions with which NAICU is expected to deal, and that it would be a gross disservice to the higher education community of this and succeeding generations, as well as to the general public, if that role were to be vacated. We believe it is true, as stated in the foundation proposal, that

> "education in the liberal arts and sciences--traditionally nurtured by the independent colleges and universities, though not by them alone--is endangered by a mounting and potentially exaggerated emphasis, responding to social and economic pressures, on the vocational and technical.

But we do not see the AAC primarily as a philosophic advocate of liberal arts, narrowly conceived. We see it as an agency in which educational questions transcend institutional interests. We would hope that AAC would not need to consider itself as the representative of a group of institutions, although that may be an unrealistic hope. At least it should not be a general service agency whose worth to the institution would be measured exclusively by what services were performed in return for dues. We would see its new status as freeing it from undue concern with the mechanics of institutions and allowing it to approach basic educational policy issues, questions about the nature of higher education, consideration of the functions and problems that are intrinsic to the educational process and its appropriate environment. Certainly this will involve the liberal arts, or arts and sciences, but not as self-contained concerns. They relate to contemporary people and contemporary needs. The educational process goes on in a real world, where heavy demands are placed upon it. There seems to us to be a risk that in seeking to meet the demands of others education may lose its own character.

This is not to say that AAC has not in the past been the kind of an organization we have in mind. One of the reasons that the annual meeting is given such a high rating, in comparison with other organizational annual meetings, we were told, is that it has given relatively larger place to educational issues. It has been

less tempted to convert its sessions into workshops for administrators. So long as it was viewed also as the primary national representative of independent institutions, however, it was being drawn into that sort of programming. It will now be free to be the forum of ideas and the champion of those it chooses to espouse.

The public mood in educational matters sometimes shifts rapidly and quite unaccountably. Currently it seems self-evident that the values of education are so linked to employment that other personal and social needs are eclipsed. What will the mood be when all the pipelines of vocationally trained persons are filled, as they very well could be further down the road? Will the focus then shift again to where the AAC concerns have traditionally been? Will the public, which now clamors for virtual identification of education and employable skills for everyone, then be equally critical of the failure to provide for broader human and social needs? When that happens we would not like to see them point to the demise of AAC as exhibit A for the failure to provide leadership when it was most sorely needed--which is now.

We cannot avoid the pressing question whether such an organization is viable. Almost everyone would grant that it is desirable, but can it survive in the economic crunch of today's academic community? We believe that it can, although we acknowledge the risks involved.

Let us recall some parallels from the history of AAC. When teacher education moved out of the AAC into the Association for Colleges of Teacher Education a major concern of member institutions was removed from the AAC agenda, and AAC was to that extent changed.

Similarly when the public relations interest was transferred from an active Commission on Public Relations to the American College Public Relations Association there were implications for AAC. And when the highly dynamic and promising field of joint fund-raising from industry was transferred from the umbrella of the Association to operate under its own auspices, the AAC seemed to have lost something integral to its conception of its mission. In each of these situations it was possible to argue that the activity involved--teacher education, public relations, approaches to industry for support--would have to talk about liberal arts and therefore needed the strength which came from affiliation with AAC. On the other hand, AAC could well have felt that the detachment of these concerns from it would sever its contacts with the practical needs of its members to a degree which could be fatal to its continued functioning. There is no doubt that AAC was altered by those actions, but it has continued to be a useful instrument for other interests. It may now appear that the federal relations aspect of its activity is so integral to its future that to set it free to form its own separate structure will have disastrous consequences for AAC.

We do not concur in this judgment. Ninety current public members have apparently found other values in membership since they have not expected AAC to represent them in federal relations. We have found strong advocates for a liberal arts voice in both public and independent institutions. We think it is highly significant that in ranking the options for structuring AAC and NCICU in the questionnaire, the alternative of eliminating AAC

and giving the field over, so to speak, to NCICU was emphatically rejected (see Tables 5-7, pages 53a-c). While respondents were willing, if necessary, to sacrifice the public members in AAC, they were not willing to sacrifice the national concern for the liberal arts.

Moreover, AAC now has extensive activities under way, some of them separately funded from outside sources, which are unrelated to the representation of the independent sector in federal relations. Research and Service Project income for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, totaled $752,136, of which less than $120,000 might be expected to transfer to the new organization. There is no reason for supposing that an AAC without involvement in federal relations will not be as attractive to foundations as one with federal relations. The separation of public policy activities is estimated by AAC staff to remove expenditure items of about $250,000 from its operating budget. Given this saving it is believed that income from dues needed to carry on the balance of the program, plus some new initiatives, will be about $375,000 to $385,000. This would compare with dues receipts of $574,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. If one could assume retention of all members this would result in a per institution reduction on the average from something over $800 per institution to under $600.

Nonetheless, there may well be a risk to AAC in this change. Perhaps a number of institutions will terminate their membership in AAC when they join the new organization. We have discussed possible ways to reduce this risk. This has included conversations with foundation representatives. One option which elicits some

support would be to set up a budget for AAC and set dues at a level which would be necessary to carry it assuming current membership, and then ask a group of foundations to set up a fund for a two or three year period which would take care of the shrinkage due to drops in membership.

It should go without saying that if in the reorganization called for in these recommendations there are dislocations of personnel for whom the Board of AAC has any continuing responsibility or commitment those responsibilities and commitments should be honored. Even where there is no such explicit responsibility or commitment, care should be exercised in giving adequate notice and in making adjustments to avoid undue hardship for persons who might not become employees of either organization.

XI. We recommend that the purpose of AAC be to actively promote concern for and discussion of basic educational policy issues, with special emphasis on arts and sciences and on the functions and problems that are intrinsic to the educational process and its environment. This should include public understanding of educational issues in general and the liberal arts in particular.

In discussing the case for recommending the continuation of AAC we have commented at some length on the role which we envisaged for it. We may now specify somewhat more precisely the sorts of functions and activities we have had in mind.

1. It should initiate and administer activities and projects relevant to its concern, such as the current Project on Change in Liberal Education.

2. It should stimulate activities and projects related to its purpose within and among institutions.

3. It should explore and interpret the contemporary role of liberal arts in relation to vocational and professional programs.

4. It should anticipate developments in the physical and social environment and interpret their effect on education, such as the "limits of growth" issue.

5. It should explore implications of non-traditional and lifelong learning programs for the liberal arts and possible contributions which the liberal arts can make to such programs.

6. It should enter into relations and joint activities with organizations or groups with comparable interests.

7. It should sponsor seminars, annual meetings, and perhaps on occasion "congresses" of liberal learning or aspects of it, either on its own or in cooperation with other agencies.

We lay particular stress on the opportunity which we believe exists for AAC to take a leadership position in these matters, providing it is willing to become a leader in cooperative activities. It must be ready to take initiatives in working with the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences (representing about 200 public institutions), the American Conference of Academic Deans, the Association for Innovative Higher Education, the Commission on Arts and Sciences of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Commission on Cultural Arts of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the new National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and whoever else has a concern which overlaps or abuts those of the AAC.

This is a price to be paid. We are told that cooperation is difficult to achieve in Washington, and this may be true. Certainly processes get slowed down and those engaged in them must be prepared to be frustrated. We found more readiness to get together out in the field than we did in Washington, especially

among those who were already involved in cooperative projects. A degree of cynicism seems to be an occupational hazard. We think, however, that AAC is strong enough, and will be free enough from partisan institutitonal interests, to make a real impact. We recommend that it proceed without delay to bring together representatives of related organizations and agencies to explore some of the possibilities of cooperation. As we have pursued our inquiry we have explored the potential interest in such an effort and have been encouraged to believe that it would work.

XII. We recommend that the AAC Board and staff explore the possibility of providing some sort of membership to individuals and organizations, in addition to institutions.

We have noted that liberal arts is less coordinate with institutions that it once was. Liberal arts colleges frequently have a divided focus. There are indications, also, that the president may find it necessary to focus on issues other than academic. Survival and survival with quality may be prerequisites for any kind of good academic program, but it may be that the president is not now the most logical representative of his institution if the AAC is to become even stronger in its emphasis on educational issues. Perhaps the dynamic needed to maintain a strong program in the AAC is to be found in the academic deans. Several times it was pointed out to us that academic deans do not have a national home. Toward that end, we strongly recommend even closer association between the AAC and the American Conference of Academic Deans.

But beyond such official representation of institutions through presidents or deans, we believe there should be an opportunity for

individuals to affiliate. There may be many deans who would like to join even though their institutions are not members. There are also faculty spokesmen for the arts and sciences who would welcome a forum for the discussion of basic educational issues. While there may be some danger that such individual memberships will take the place of institutional memberships, we think it would be possible to allow substantially reduced rates for individual memberships in institutions which are members. Or an institutional membership might carry a bonus of several individual memberships. Similarly, there are related organizations, whose interests are more specific and fragmented, who might welcome an opportunity to engage in more comprehensive discussions and activities. We are not prepared to suggest the specific nature of such membership but we believe that it is important to provide as many channels of communication as possible between the AAC and the entire academic community.

If such changes are made in membership there may need to be parallel changes in the Board to provide representation for the different membership groups.

XIII. We recommend that the time table for these changes be as follows:

1. The decision to establish a new organization to represent the independent sector should be made at the earliest possible date. We believe the decisive action should take place at the annual meetings February 8-10.

It is important that something decisive happen in connection with this annual meeting. We encountered considerable skepticism about whether any change would occur, and if representatives return to their homes without knowing whether or not anything is

going to happen they will be unhappy. Moreover, the organization is needed as soon as it can be put in place.

2. After the initial decisions, sufficient time should be taken to put the new organization together and make it operative so that it is done with care and so that all segments of its potential constituency may feel that they have been involved.

While there is urgency in getting the organization operative, we believe that various segments of the constituency may need to be more involved in at least a consultative role in putting the organization together so that they will feel more fully identified with it.

3. If it is possible to work out an interim agreement with AAC to continue current arrangements for a period of months, perhaps until June 30, while the new organization is coming into being, it would be advantageous to both organizations. We think the new organization should be fully operative and the separation complete not later than June 30.

XIV. We recommend that great care be taken in the choice of leadership for the new organization and that the top executive be given considerable freedom to develop the organizational structure and to recommend staffing.

The key to the effectiveness of the new organization will clearly be the quality of leadership it is able to attract. As we talked with other Washington organization leaders we were reminded that this involves not only personal ability but "styles of operation." We heard quite varied estimates of the number of persons that would be needed, depending on how a chief executive might choose to operate.

We hesitate to suggest any priority with regard to the qualifications to be considered or the fields from which such a person (or persons) would most likely come. Clearly such a person must have or be able to achieve the respect and confidence of the

independent educational institutions, governmental bodies and leaders involved in the legislative and executive branches and of the other members of the educational secretariat in Washington.

We wish to underscore, however, the importance that must be attached to this choice. We believe that the organization should proceed with such dispatch that an authorized body would be in place to search out and employ the best available top leadership well in advance of June 30. We believe also that major responsibility for developing the federal relations team should be his. In the meantime it would be our expectation that current staff would continue in the posts they now occupy.

Exhibit A

ILLUSTRATIVE INCOME PROJECTIONS

AAC

AAC staff members have estimated a minimum need of $375-385,000 from membership dues. Assuming the current membership figure of 712, the minimum would virtually be reached by the following allocations.

Below 501	- 40 @ $300	$ 12,000
501 - 1100	- 210 @ 500	105,000
1101 - 2000	- 179 @ 500	89,500
2001 - 5000	- 116 @ 600	69,600
5001 - 10,000	- 45 @ 600	27,000
Above 10,000	- 22 @ 600	13,200
Public members	- 54 @ 600	54,000
	Total	$370,300

NAICU

For a full year of operation it is probable that about $500,000 would be needed, although some national organizations have suggested that a lower figure would be adequate. Assuming that current members of NCICU (1001) will retain membership the following dues structure would provide fully adequate funding. It assumes six to eight staff persons.

Below 501	- 200 @ $300	$ 60,000
501 - 1100	- 355 @ 500	177,500
1101 - 2000	- 227 @ 700	158,900
2001 - 5000	- 142 @ 800	113,600
5001 - 10,000	- 56 @ 900	50,400
Above 10,000	- 23 @ 1000	23,000
	Total	$583,400

Combined Dues

	Current AAC	Combined AAC and NCICU
Below 501	$500	$ 600
501 - 1100	900	1000
1101 - 2000	900	1200
2001 - 5000	900	1400
5001 - 10,000	900	1500
Above 10,000	900	1600